Oakland Park Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oakland Park Elementary School

936 NE 33RD ST, Oakland Park, FL 33334

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Garcia

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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 (51%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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 Broward 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

Oakland Park Elementary School

936 NE 33RD ST, Oakland Park, FL 33334

[no web address on file]

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	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Oakland Park Elementary school is "Opportunity Promotes Excellence". We believe that given the opportunity, ALL students will meet with success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Oakland Park Elementary is "All students will achieve to their greatest potential in an environment of caring and trust". Providing a welcoming and safe environment will create a culture of success, motivation, self-awareness and achievement.

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
Garcia, Michelle	Principal	Oversees the day to day operation of the school facility. Ensures that quality teaching and learning are taking place in classrooms. Monitors the learning environment by conducting classroom visits. Monitors student performance data to increase student achievement.
walker, ricky	Math Coach	Responsible for monitoring the mathematics curriculum. Provides mathematics modeling and support to teachers to increase teacher efficacy and student achievement.
mcmahon, dawn	Reading Coach	Responsible for monitoring the English Language Arts curriculum. Provides ELA modeling and support to teachers to increase teacher efficacy and student achievement.
Brown, Tranya	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal with overseeing the day to day operation of the school facility. Ensures that quality teaching and learning are taking place in classrooms. Monitors the learning environment by conducting classroom visits. Monitors student performance data to increase student achievement.
duncan, heidi	Teacher, K-12	Provides Kindergarten grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and student achievement.
Cooper , Leah	SAC Member	Facilitates School Advisory Council meetings. Responsible for ensure that the School Improvement Plan goals are monitored and met. Ensures that all components of the school improvement plan are implemented with fidelity.
Rosen, Nadiya	School Counselor	Provides mental health services to students that allow them to focus on learning and achievement.
Price, Rosemary	Teacher, K-12	Provides First grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and student achievement.
Oren , Daniel	Teacher, K-12	Provides Second grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and student achievement.
Vazquez, Cari	Teacher, K-12	Provides Third grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and student achievement.
Kirkland, Rayscene	Teacher, K-12	Provides Fifth grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and student achievement.
Schafer, Maria	Teacher, PreK	Provides Pre-Kindergarten level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and student achievement.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
burton, matthew	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Support school improvement and student achievement by providing Push-in/ Pull-out support to students needing intervention or remediation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Michelle Garcia

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Total number of students enrolled at the school

541

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

4

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

2

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	99	71	61	84	71	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	4	9	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	16	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

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

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	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/23/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	87	85	91	82	106	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	38	34	29	31	40	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	3	6	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				50%	59%	57%	35%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	60%	58%	43%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				80%	54%	53%	51%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				41%	65%	63%	40%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	66%	62%	53%	60%	59%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	53%	51%	57%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				18%	46%	53%	28%	49%	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	64%	60%	4%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	62%	-24%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	59%	-26%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	65%	-22%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	31%	67%	-36%	64%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	64%	-28%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	17%	49%	-32%	53%	-36%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 will utilize the i-Ready diagnostic assessment as a progress monitoring tool for English Language Arts and Mathematics. Grade 5 will utilize Schoolcity common formative assessments as the science progress monitoring tool.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.4	17.4	28.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.1	16.9	26.7
	Students With Disabilities	44.4	11.1	22.2
	English Language Learners	29.6	14.8	18.5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	14	13
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.4	20.3	16.7
	Students With Disabilities	33.3	11.1	11.1
	English Language Learners	25.9	22.2	14.8

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18.3	20.5	33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.5	24.2	40.6
	Students With Disabilities	14.3	14.3	33.3
	English Language Learners	6.8	2.3	20.9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9.9	16	24.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.5	20.3	29.7
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	2.3	0	11.6

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29.6	26.8	29.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.7	28.3	32.2
	Students With Disabilities	33.3	25	33.3
	English Language Learners	6.1	5.9	11.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9.7	19.7	20.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.1	20.8	22
	Students With Disabilities	11.1	25	22.2
	English Language Learners	0	5.9	8.3

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10.6	15.1	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.1	12.9	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	7.1	
	English Language Learners	2.4	4.9	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9.6	20.4	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.7	13	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	7.1	
	English Language Learners	4.8	9.5	

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11.8	18.7	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.7	19.4	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	12.1	12.1	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9.1	12	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.4	12.9	33.3
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	5.9	5.9	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	17	26
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11	0	0
	English Language Learners	7	8	19

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	35	27		29	40		36				
ELL	52	67	100	32	44	67	32				
BLK	52	59		31	35		37				
HSP	47	60	100	33	39		31				
FRL	49	57	100	31	38	62	35				
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	27	67		31	48	50	5				
ELL	48	66	81	38	48	47	12				
BLK	44	62	79	34	50	47	17				
HSP	51	67	78	43	49	45	12				
WHT	63	80		56	53						

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
FRL	49	68	83	39	49	49	17				
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	22	53	67	25	48	46	20				
ELL	24	43	57	31	49	61	10				
BLK	34	39	41	34	44	43	16				
HSP	30	45	56	39	60	71	28				
WHT	45	42		52	48		53				
FRL	32	41	50	38	51	58	24				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	41
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	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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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?

In first grade, we noticed student scores in ELA decreased from the Fall to Winter checkpoints for all students including our subgroups. Then scores from the Winter to Spring checkpoints showed an increase but didn't return to the Fall level. Within the second grade there was a steady increase in the ELA scores from Fall to Winter to Spring checkpoints in the Economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities subgroups. The ELL subgroup showed a decrease in ELA proficiency from fall to winter, but those scores rebounded from winter to spring and surpassed the fall proficiency level. Grade 3 experienced a slight dip in ELA proficiency scores from fall to winter, but saw the scores return to fall proficiency levels on the spring checkpoint with all students including subgroups. Grades 4 and 5 saw an increase in ELA proficiency scores from the fall to winter progress monitoring checkpoint. Both grade levels also experienced a large decrease in ELA proficiency levels during the spring checkpoint.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, Math learning gains demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Across all grade levels math was significantly below average. In grades 3-5, math learning gains went down 2% and lowest quartile went down 9%.

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 to Oakland Park's need for improvement in math learning gains were opportunities for remediation and the correlation between what they were lacking and what they needed was not aligned. New actions taken are consistent spiral review of standards taught, New Math Coach, increase usage of manipulatives, and implementation of Math Seminar to review skills taught.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, ELA lowest quartile demonstrated a 29% increase as demonstrated on the Florida Standards Assessment. ELA Learning gains increased by 24% and overall proficiency increased by 15%.

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

The contributing factors to Oakland Park's improvement are an aligned focus calendar with built in review, authentic targeted resources aligned areas of weakness and extended learning opportunities were taught by teachers with the greatest impact.

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

Strategies need to be implement accelerated earning are ESSR teachers providing push-in support to help remediate/enrich standards taught, targeted professional development, and professional learning

communities aligned to the new reading series. Math professional development for IREADY, Acaletics, Touch Math, hands-on manipulatives, Deeper Dive and Critical Content PD

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.

IREADY professional development
Professional development activities aligned to the new reading series:
ELA Instructional Materials Part I and II
Deeper Dive
Content Specific
ORR -Oral Reading Record
Horizon Intervention Program
Writing aligned to Benchmark Advance

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

Ongoing professional development in ELA, Math and Science
Extended Learning Opportunities starting in October
Alignment of resources in ELA, Math and Science
On-going progress monitoring in ELA, Math and Science
IREADY Data Analysis of sub-groups

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data from the ELA 2021 Florida Standards Assessment, 45% of students in 3rd grade, 34% of students in 4th, 54% of students in 5th grade scored at or above a Level 3.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, each intermediate grade level will reach at least 50% proficiency in ELA as demonstrated on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	Our Area of Focus will be monitored with fidelity through Common Formative Assessments, Oral Reading records (ORR), and I-Ready.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	dawn mcmahon (dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategies being implemented in ELA is targeted small group instruction and strategic intervention using Horizons reading program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Horizon Reading Intervention Program was selected based on the components of the program.

Action Steps to Implement

Small group instruction based on student weaknesses
Push-in support from ESSR and Resource teachers
Data Chats with students, teachers, and ESSR teachers
Progress monitoring of standards mastered and those that need remediation

The Reading Coach is responsible for ensuring that small group instruction is happening everyday in the ELA block. She is also responsible for monitoring the schedule of the ESSR and Resource teacher to ensure that they are meeting with on a daily basis and to review and analyze the data from the progress monitoring tool.

Person Responsible	dawn mcmahon (dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The student with disabilities subgroup was identified as a critical need area based on data showing that less than 41% of students in this subgroup met proficiency levels in English Language Arts.
Measurable Outcome:	Oakland Park Elementary plans to increase the proficiency level of the SWD subgroup from 35% to 41% based on student performance on the Florida Standards Assessment ELA test.
Monitoring:	Our Area of Focus will be monitored with fidelity through Common Formative Assessments, Oral Reading records (ORR), and I-Ready.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	dawn mcmahon (dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategies being implemented in ELA is targeted small group instruction and strategic intervention using Horizons reading program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Horizon Reading Intervention Program was selected based on the components of the program.

Action Steps to Implement

Small group instruction based on student weaknesses
Push-in support from ESSR and Resource teachers
Data Chats with students, teachers, and ESSR teachers
Progress monitoring of standards mastered and those that need remediation

The Reading Coach is responsible for ensuring that small group instruction is happening everyday in the ELA block. She is also responsible for monitoring the schedule of the ESSR and Resource teacher to ensure that they are meeting with on a daily basis and to review and analyze the data from the progress monitoring tool.

Person Responsible	dawn mcmahon (dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

In comparison to the statewide data, Oakland Park Elementary reported 0.5 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students.

Our primary focus for the 2021-2022 school year, in regards to discipline is to enforce our School-wide Positive Behavior Plan. This plan is all encompassing because it focuses on patterns/trends in discipline history, positive rewards for students, and a plan of action for monitoring the plan.

We are a CHAMPS school. All teachers have been trained in CHAMP Strategies. We implement CHAMPS not only i the classroom, but also in the cafeteria, hallways and restrooms. We also celebrate those students doing well (no referrals) through ice cream parties, pizza parties, etc.

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.

Oakland Park Elementary foster a positive school culture and environment by always putting the student first. We build a positive school culture and environment by teaching, enforcing and monitoring our school expectations of Be Respectful, Be Responsible, and Be Safe. All teachers have been trained in the CHAMPS strategy for behavior. CHAMPS is implemented throughout the school in classrooms, hallways, cafeteria and restrooms. We also celebrate those students doing well (no referrals) by acknowledging them on morning announcement and through ice cream parties, pizza parties, etc.

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

The school leadership team and the rest of the staff are responsible for promoting a positive culture and environment. Every adult at Oakland Park Elementary has a role in enforcing and promoting our school-wide expectations.
Administration - Acknowledging students on morning announcement and providing incentives for good behavior.

Guidance Counselor - conducting small group lessons about positive behavior.
Teachers, Office staff, Custodians - Praising students when they are Caught Being Good.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$7,788.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0031 - Oakland Park Elementary School	Title, I Part C	300.0	$4,500.00
			Notes: Purchase of RALLY and READY Reading and Math			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0031 - Oakland Park Elementary School	Title, I Part C	200.0	$3,288.00
			Notes: Schoolcity Subscription			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$24,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5200		0031 - Oakland Park Elementary School	IDEA	44.0	$24,000.00
			Notes: Self-contained materials and supplies: (i.e.Touch Math, etc.)			
					Total:	$31,788.00