

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Oak Grove Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Oak Grove Elementary School

6315 N ARMENIA AVE, Tampa, FL 33604

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jerry Franchino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (53%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Oak Grove Elementary School

6315 N ARMENIA AVE, Tampa, FL 33604

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilkins, Pamela	Principal	Analyze school-wide data both within the content and among grade level teams. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
Martell, Kim	Assistant Principal	Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
Coleman, Michelle	Other	Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process at the intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. Analyze data to determine student needs.
Suits, Marissa	Reading Coach	Support (through modeling, coaching, and professional development opportunities) the implementation of high quality instructional reading practices at the core level by collaborating with teachers in planning, delivering and assessing using data driven instruction.
Trippany, Kristy	Math Coach	Support (through modeling, coaching, and professional development opportunities) the implementation of high quality instructional math practices at the core level by collaborating with teachers in planning, delivering and assessing using data driven instruction.
Kleiner, Kelly	Other	Ensure the delivery of services to and for Exceptional needs students. Assist in individualized plans to meet the needs of students.
Connell, Kimberly	Other	Support the implementation of high quality instructional reading practices at the core and intervention level by collaborating with teachers in planning, delivering and assessing using data driven instruction.
Fiedler, Yolanda	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ensure the delivery of services to and for English Language learner students. Assist in instructional planning aimed at meeting the needs of ELL students.
Citek-Gary, Dulcie	Other	Provide additional support for the implementation of high quality instructional reading practices at the core level by collaborating with teachers in planning, delivering and assessing using data driven instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Jerry Franchino

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

690

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

10

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

7

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	112	121	103	102	97	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	654
Attendance below 90 percent	1	27	25	30	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	13	24	30	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

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	135	112	97	119	111	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	691
Attendance below 90 percent	26	32	18	27	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	135	112	97	119	111	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	691
Attendance below 90 percent	26	32	18	27	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				47%	52%	57%	48%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	55%	58%	58%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	50%	53%	67%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	54%	63%	63%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	57%	62%	70%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	46%	51%	66%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				38%	50%	53%	56%	51%	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	41%	52%	-11%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-ready diagnostic assessments and

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%	25%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	23%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	16%	15%	24%
	English Language Learners	6%	16%	26%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	22%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	23%	2%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	12%	27%
	English Language Learners	6%	16%	26%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20%	29%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	27%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	11%	22%
	English Language Learners	10%	18%	19%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7%	17%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	11%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	4%	25%
	English Language Learners	7%	13%	28%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21%	28%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	18%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	11%	17%
	English Language Learners	9%	19%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5%	15%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	5%	1%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	20%
	English Language Learners	3%	9%	25%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%	27%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	13%	9%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	2%	12%
	English Language Learners	8%	17%	30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	20%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	6%	2%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	10%	17%
	English Language Learners	9%	23%	37%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	27%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	9%	4%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	27%	18%
	English Language Learners	15%	15%	18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	23%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	7%	1%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	13%	27%
	English Language Learners	4%	13%	30%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	51%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	40%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	42%	25%
	English Language Learners	20%	41%	7%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	14	8	31	34	20	33				
ELL	40	32	44	47	52	28	38				
BLK	31			23							
HSP	43	34	36	46	46	24	33				
MUL	36			45							
WHT	43	33		39	36		33				
FRL	41	35	35	41	43	20	33				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	50	44	49	56	46	17				
ELL	40	55	57	59	62	58	28				
BLK	36	43	33	42	46	42	20				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	46	54	57	64	62	55	35				
MUL	27			64							
WHT	69	78		63	60		75				
FRL	46	54	50	60	58	52	35				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	46	55	43	60	63	20				
ELL	40	55	64	56	72	70	39				
BLK	33	67	70	60	71		47				
HSP	48	58	70	62	69	66	53				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	64	46		71	70		80				
FRL	47	57	66	63	70	65	55				

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	27
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	38
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	41
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	38
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	36
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?

All grade levels showed a continual progress according to I-ready, but FSA showed significant declines across content areas.

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

Learning gains for both ELA and Math showed the 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?

Learning gain scores fell on the fifth grade students, as they were the only students with previous FSA scores. This year there are more students able to demonstrate learning gains on FSA. Data for retained third grade, fourth and fifth grade students will be analyzed to determine what students need to show learning gains. Teachers can use this data for goal setting with students.

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

All areas showed a decline but Science Achievement had the least decline.

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

Our scores from the 2020 school year showed science as an area needing improvement. We increased our focus on science instruction which allowed for less decline in this area. Teachers will need to ensure they are able to spiral in standards that may have gaps from COVID and e-learning.

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

Teachers will need to analyze student data and utilize data to plan for small group instruction that will help close the gaps to allow on level instruction to be more effective.

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.

Teachers will participate in PLC meetings to dive into student data and analyze data to create data driven plans that will drive instruction. Teachers will also participate in a content specific book study that will help them with strategies that align with the principles of effective instruction classroom walkthrough form being used by the district.

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

A reading resource teacher will aid in small group instruction for targeted students. ILT's will help to dive into data and focus on acceleration instead of remediation to drive next steps.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading data had an impact on Science Achievement this school year. Lowest quartile Math and ELA learning Gains also dropped more than other areas. Also our African American Students and students with disabilities struggled to make gains and be proficient. Small group instruction with acceleration will make sure all students needs are met, therefore increasing student learning gains and achievement. Teachers working together to integrate content instruction across all subjects will increase student achievement. Teachers will be aware of the African American and students with disabilities in their classrooms and closely monitor their growth and progress and continue to use small group instruction and acceleration to meet their needs.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>ELA proficiency will increase from 42% to 55%.</p> <p>ELA learning gains will increase from 34% to 60%.</p> <p>ELA BQ gains will increase from 32% to 60%.</p> <p>Math proficiency will increase from 43% to 65%.</p> <p>Math learning gains will increase from 44% to 65%.</p> <p>Math BQ gains will increase from 20% to 60%.</p> <p>Science proficiency will increase from 34% to 50%.</p>
Monitoring:	The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs, aid in data chats to dive into data after common assessments are given, assist with weekly team planning meetings to discuss small group instruction and acceleration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Pamela Wilkins (pamela.wilkins@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Content area resource teachers will plan with teachers to help incorporate evidence-based teaching strategies and acceleration using various resources with technology and other supplemental resources throughout their lessons based on student data. Professional development will be provided to teachers based on current best practices and evidence-based strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will promote professional growth and help implement best practices in instruction to support all our learners in face to face learning format.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Content area and RtI resource teachers will work with teachers with individual coaching, professional development, and planning sessions to assist in developing instruction that is data driven using supplemental and technology based instruction where appropriate for meeting the needs of our learners.

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

2. Data chats and plc meetings will be held regularly to analyze student data and plan to use that data to drive their instruction.

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

3. Teachers and PSLT will work to monitor data and student response to intervention, and move students through the MTSS process.

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

4. Teachers will use evidence based, differentiated teaching materials, technology and paper based resources, and strategies to reach all learners.

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

5. Teachers will utilize district approved technology resources to help accelerate learning (Myon, Iready, Teacher Toolbox, code.org, Nearpod and Flocabulary as well as technology based resources embedded in currently adopted curriculum.)

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our data shows low ELA proficiency scores, a drop in ELA Learning gains and data from Impact Review Walkthroughs shows ELA to be an area of focus for this school year.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency will increase from 42% to 55%.
 ELA learning gains will increase from 34% to 60%.
 ELA BQ gains will increase from 32% to 60%.

Monitoring: Engage in classroom walkthroughs to collect data on small group strategy use with text. Analyze walkthrough data (the level of strategy use with text and student discourse in small group instruction). Collaborate to determine plan for next steps for support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Pamela Wilkins (pamela.wilkins@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will increase student engagement in small groups through use of aligned strategies and student discourse opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies will promote professional growth and help implement best practices in instruction to support all our learners in face to face learning format.

Action Steps to Implement

Work with the Professional Development (PD) department to provide professional development to teachers that will provide them specific strategies to increase student discourse opportunities in small group instruction.

Person Responsible Kim Martell (kim.martell@hcps.net)

Implement coaching cycles around teacher clarity of strategy model and student discourse opportunities within small group instruction and its relation to the text. The coach will use the data from walkthroughs and IR visit to prioritize teachers and then leverage this knowledge to work with the teacher to develop the focus for the coaching.

Person Responsible Marissa Suits (marissa.suits@hcps.net)

Identify and develop a teacher in order to create a demonstration classroom to show teachers across grades 3-5 how strategy model, practice, and student discourse opportunities within small group instruction connected to text could look like. Coach can support teachers by scheduling fishbowl lessons and side by side coaching sessions within this demonstration classrooms and providing a “look for” document to keep them focused the above elements.

Person Responsible Dulcie Citek-Gary (dulcie.citek-gary@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

During the 2019-2020 school year, Oak Grove had 20 referrals for students that exhibited violent behaviors such as physical attacks, threat or intimidation and fighting. This data places Oak Grove in the Very high category. Based off this data, Oak Grove has implemented a new cafeteria behavior plan and will be monitoring and discussing referral data monthly within our PBIS committee. Mental health reports will also be considered on a monthly basis as reported by student services.

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.

Oak Grove Elementary communicates with parents in both English and Spanish. We encourage parents, community members, volunteers to help at our school. We hold several family events throughout the school year to help our parents and community be involved.

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

Students from neighboring High Schools and colleges tutor and mentor our students throughout the year. The organization Seniors in Service works daily with our primary classrooms. We encourage our parents to be an active part of our school and their child's education.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00