

St. Lucie Public Schools

Oak Hammock K 8 School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oak Hammock K 8 School

1251 SW CALIFORNIA BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/oak/>

Demographics

Principal: Jaclyn Lee

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	73%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (57%)
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 was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oak Hammock K 8 School

1251 SW CALIFORNIA BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/oak/>

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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

Teachers will design authentic and satisfying work that will challenge and engage every child, equipping each to become a productive member of a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Oak Hammock K-8 School will be a vibrant learning environment that nurtures each student to continuously improve academic performance. The students will learn to become contributing citizens in a school community that is respectful, responsible, safe, and positive. The school will foster a love of teaching and learning for students to carry through to graduation, so they may reach their full potential in life.

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
Galloway, Patricia	Principal	Overall School Program
Lee, Jaclyn	Assistant Principal	Middle Grades Supervision
McClendon-Morgan, Danita	Assistant Principal	Elementary Grades Supervision
Martin, Amber	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach/Literacy Coaching K-8

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/11/2021, Jaclyn Lee

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.*

5

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

106

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,572

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

19

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

15

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	124	123	134	142	138	146	218	233	254	0	0	0	0	1512
Attendance below 90 percent	18	22	20	25	17	21	33	45	47	0	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	7	5	13	23	38	30	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	13	51	21	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	0	22	13	6	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	9	3	17	9	1	35	92	104	0	0	0	0	273

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	1	40	31	39	58	112	101	0	0	0	0	387

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

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	114	135	125	124	141	143	214	238	241	0	0	0	0	1475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	12	9	10	18	25	29	36	0	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	5	8	3	3	5	19	35	46	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	4	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	26	40	45	39	0	0	0	0	165
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	37	57	62	28	0	0	0	0	197

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	1	0	12	25	45	60	40	0	0	0	0	184

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	114	135	125	124	141	143	214	238	241	0	0	0	0	1475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	12	9	10	18	25	29	36	0	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	5	8	3	3	5	19	35	46	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	4	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	26	40	45	39	0	0	0	0	165
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	37	57	62	28	0	0	0	0	197

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	1	0	12	25	45	60	40	0	0	0	0	184

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				50%	60%	61%	48%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	58%	59%	52%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	50%	54%	49%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				55%	58%	62%	60%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				50%	56%	59%	64%	57%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	46%	52%	58%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				51%	58%	56%	54%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				64%	74%	78%	82%	74%	77%

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	43%	50%	-7%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
06	2021					
	2019	57%	51%	6%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
07	2021					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
06	2021					
	2019	71%	47%	24%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
07	2021					
	2019	49%	50%	-1%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2021					
	2019	24%	34%	-10%	46%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	46%	-2%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	54%	48%	6%	48%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	66%	67%	-1%	71%	-5%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	51%	20%	61%	10%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring was iReady Diagnostics. Science and Civics progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21%	17%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	12%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	13%	25%
	English Language Learners	22%	11%	32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16%	21%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	18%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	25%	20%
	English Language Learners	17%	11%	17%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78%	88%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	77%	89%	88%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	43%	62%
	English Language Learners	63%	94%	88%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77%	80%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72%	76%	91%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	57%	77%
	English Language Learners	565	63%	88%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67%	66%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	65%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	28%	29%	33%
	English Language Learners	56%	33%	44%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60%	63%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	59%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	33%	52%
	English Language Learners	44%	44%	67%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74%	81%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67%	72%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	33%	31%
	English Language Learners	65%	77%	71%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	72%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61%	64%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	30%	41%	59%
	English Language Learners	44%	50%	73%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	52%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	54%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	26%	21%
	English Language Learners	28%	22%	41%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58%	60%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	60%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	28%	28%	21%
	English Language Learners	44%	28%	21%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41%	42%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	35%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	27%	56%	67%
	English Language Learners	18%	22%	28%
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55%	46%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49%	42%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	9%	17%
	English Language Learners	24%	18%	29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59%	61%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	59%	66%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	24%	23%
	English Language Learners	29%	63%	53%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51%	48%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	44%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	12%	19%
	English Language Learners	29%	8%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52%	40%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	35%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	23%	30%
	English Language Learners	42%	29%	20%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	21%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	18%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	4%	4%
	English Language Learners	15%	8%	14%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	38%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41%	40%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	14%	16%
	English Language Learners	25%	0%	20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	24%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	26%	15%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	23%	26%
	English Language Learners	0%	22%	20%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	45%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	46%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	16%	16%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	0%

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	18	45	51	20	46	45	28	30			
ELL	34	49	50	30	41	38	11	45			
ASN	50	50		53	9		60				
BLK	38	45	39	24	30	29	20	45	26		
HSP	52	55	54	44	41	35	42	57	54		
MUL	53	54	55	38	41		48		50		
WHT	51	46	47	47	39	38	46	64	64		
FRL	44	51	50	35	34	35	33	55	47		
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	24	46	45	27	41	38	24	31			
ELL	32	51	36	39	47	45	36	55			

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
ASN	83	74		87	63						
BLK	37	48	45	44	45	43	34	52	64		
HSP	54	59	47	58	54	48	48	70	71		
MUL	51	59	50	49	56	30	36				
WHT	54	56	48	59	47	35	64	66	77		
FRL	45	54	45	47	45	38	42	61	68		
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	14	34	36	27	50	46	14	63			
ELL	23	47	48	44	63	67	25				
ASN	50	62		75	62		55				
BLK	42	51	52	50	60	62	45	77	89		
HSP	50	50	47	61	64	62	51	76	76		
MUL	43	54		50	48		57				
WHT	50	53	46	65	66	46	65	90	96		
FRL	43	50	47	54	62	57	49	76	84		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	39
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	44
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	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	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Analysis

Data 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?

Overall Math achievement and learning gains saw a decline in performance. In the area of Math achievement the following grade levels were above our school performance: 4th Grade-49%, 6th-49%, with 3rd and 8th grades showing the lowest achievement. In the area of ELA achievement the following grade levels exceeded our school goal and performance: 6th Grade- 53%, 8th Grade- 56%, with 5th grade, 3rd grade, and 7th grade showing the largest gaps in performance from our school. In Science achievement 5th grade performed at 34%, while 8th grade was at 38%.

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

Math L25% showed the lowest performance at 33%. Students with disabilities showed Math proficiency at 16%.

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

A contributing factor was that the scope of planning was too narrow to fully address the Math standards, as well as a decline in the minutes of weekly collaborative planning for teachers. A renewed focus, with an updated schedule, on Collaborative Learning and Planning will be utilized.

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

Based off 2021 state assessments, ELA L25% learning gains remained the same and no data components showed improvement.

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

In the area of ELA L25% learning gains, a six week after school tutoring program was initiated. Additionally, iReady professional development addressed analysis of significant gaps and action planning for remediation.

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

New ELA curriculum will be implemented in Grades K-8 this year.
Math interventionist will be added.
Renewed focus with an increase in weekly minutes for Collaborative Learning and Planning.

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.

Training for new ELA curriculum.

Iready professional development for Math teachers.

An increase in Collaborative Learning and Planning minutes for all teachers.

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

Math interventionist will be added to support the needs of our Lowest 25% students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus	Instructional Planning using Universal Design for Learning. Analysis of student achievement data indicates L25% and SWD are not achieving at the same rate as non-disabled higher achieving peers in reading and math.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ELAL25% will increase to 50% (from 49%) -Math L25% will increase to 50% (Increase of 17%) -50% of Students with Disabilities will make a learning gain in ELA -50% of Students with Disabilities will make a learning gain in Math -The number of students participating in the LRE will increase by 1%
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring will occur after each instructional unit with unit assessments, as well as three times a year through the iReady diagnostic assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patricia Galloway (patricia.galloway@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>A school-wide approach for planning and implementing Universal Design for Learning across all instructional and non-instructional school contexts will be adopted.</p> <p>Professional Development (Collaborative Learning and Planning) monitored by Instructional Coach and collaboration with Interventionists who support Learning for L25%. Providing LRE for Students with Disabilities</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To provide a blueprint for creating instructional goals, methods, materials and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individuals. Research indicates that placement for Students with Disabilities in the LRE tend to have increased academic skills, increased social and emotional skills and higher percentage of students graduating from high school.

Action Steps to Implement

New teachers will be trained and veteran teachers refreshed in UDL planning for Math and ELA.

Person Responsible Amber Martin (amber.martin@stlucieschools.org)

Collaborative Planning will be monitored for Fidelity with specific attention to SWD

Person Responsible Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Data review (charts) will include ESE students to ensure performance at the same rate as non-disabled students to make informed decisions for student placement on the continuum of services.(Grade 3, 6-8)

Person Responsible Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Data review (charts) will include ESE students to ensure performance at the same rate as non-disabled students to make informed decisions for student placement on the continuum of services.(Grades K-2, 4 & 5)

Person Responsible Danita McClendon-Morgan (danita.mcclendon-morgan@stlucieschools.org)

Literacy team will make weekly rounds and provide non-evaluative feedback to enhance instruction and learning outcomes.

Person Responsible Patricia Galloway (patricia.galloway@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School Climate and Culture including Early Warning Systems. Analysis of teacher survey results, Panorama Student Survey data, student discipline data, and staff and student attendance data indicate a need to address the social and emotional learning needs of our school.
Measurable Outcome:	Parnorama favorable ratings for student belonging will increase by 5%. Student perception of teacher-student relationships will increase by 15% Student perception of student to student respect will increase by 10% Teacher and Staff personal well being will increase by 5%.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring will occur with the staff and student surveys throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patricia Galloway (patricia.galloway@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony/Lions Quest/School?Connect will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walkthrough tools. An SEL committee will be established to promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities. Attention to adult SEL will be met with the implementation of mindful minute activities to address self-care and personal well-being. A daily well-being checkin will identify areas of immediate concern.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students are lacking many of the basic life skills needed for success in school, at home and in the community. Intentional focus on cultivating SEL competencies is a proven strategy used to reduce discipline concerns, increase attendance and develop positive learning communities. Adult SEL is designed to encourage self-care to increase personal well-being to build resiliency and self-regulation as models for students. Adult SEL is designed to build depth and capacity in staff in order for them to effectively support the SEL needs of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement, reinforce and monitor for fidelity the elementary SEL program (Sanford Harmony) with common monthly focus.

Person Responsible Danita McClendon-Morgan (danita.mcclendon-morgan@stlucieschools.org)

Implement, reinforce and monitor for fidelity the middle grades SEL program (Lions Quest) with common monthly focus.

Person Responsible Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Implement adult SEL through employee recognition, mindful moments and fidelity check through daily check in and staff climate survey.

Person Responsible Patricia Galloway (patricia.galloway@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	One or more grades 3, 4 and 5 are below 50% proficiency in ELA.
Description	Grade 3: 42%
and	Grade 4: 47%
Rationale:	Grade 5: 39%

Measurable Outcome: By the end of 2022, 51% students in grades 3, 4 and 5 will show proficiency in ELA

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, K-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: - Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan) - Use Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. - Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. - Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group – using monitoring schools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments).

Person Responsible Patricia Galloway (patricia.galloway@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention

Person Responsible Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback

Person Responsible Amber Martin (amber.martin@stlucieschools.org)

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.

Reported 1.6 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all combination schools statewide, it falls in the high category and is ranked #219 out of 313 combination schools statewide. Incidents of bullying and fighting showed the highest areas of concern. Reported suspensions were ranked very high; however, declined in 2019.

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.

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.

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

By building positive relationships with our parents, families and community, we are able to satisfy our school's mission of providing our students with authentic learning opportunities, which challenge and engage them. When involving our stakeholders, we can better prepare our students for real world learning opportunities and promote future participation in our community. At Oak Hammock we encourage parent and community involvement through our parent involvement events, such as performances and student recognition. Additionally we host parent involvement events in order to provide resources and support for students at home. This promotes a productive relationship among families and schools and positively impacts student achievement.