Oak Hammock K 8 School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%)
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	ATSI
* 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 10/11/2022.

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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lee, Jaclyn	Principal	
McClendon-Morgan, Danita	Assistant Principal	
Pierce, David	Assistant Principal	
Martin, Amber	Reading Coach	
	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Jaclyn Lee

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
8

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
28

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
81

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,624

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
17

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
19

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	132	144	134	151	142	150	233	248	264	0	0	0	0	1598
Attendance below 90 percent	44	48	24	39	40	29	67	77	102	0	0	0	0	470
One or more suspensions	4	2	12	21	26	32	58	74	82	0	0	0	0	311
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	2	1	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	2	0	58	17	1	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	53	45	61	68	86	0	0	0	0	313
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	69	70	60	99	86	0	0	0	0	444
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	51	49	136	0	0	0	0	236

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/22/2022

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	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	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	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	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	53%	55%				50%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						56%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						47%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	40%	41%	42%				55%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	49%						50%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						43%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	40%	50%	54%				51%	58%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	55%	59%				64%	74%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	43%	50%	-7%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
06	2022					
	2019	57%	51%	6%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
07	2022					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
06	2022					
	2019	71%	47%	24%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
07	2022					
	2019	49%	50%	-1%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2022					
	2019	24%	34%	-10%	46%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	44%	46%	-2%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	54%	48%	6%	48%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	66%	67%	-1%	71%	-5%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	71%	51%	20%	61%	10%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	14	28	25	19	36	38	18	45			
ELL	31	45	35	31	39	33	35	70	58		
ASN	60	36		43	70						
BLK	32	40	38	31	45	48	27	61	80		
HSP	46	50	35	42	50	51	44	81	75		
MUL	38	51	67	37	68	59	40	77			
WHT	47	43	27	47	47	50	47	75	73		
FRL	40	45	37	38	50	50	31	72	75		

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			
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	52
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 ELA Achievement and Learning Gains there was a decline in performance. The following grades were above school performance in ELA Achievement: 6th Grade (43%) and 7th Grade (45%). In Learning Gains 6th Grade was above school performance (46%) and with L25% Learning Gains the following were above school performance: 5th Grade (52%) and 6th Grade (41%). In Math achievement we increased overall achievement by 1%, Learning Gains by 12%, and L25% by 17%. Civics proficiency increased 16%. Science proficiency increased by 2% with 5th Grade remaining the same. MS Acceleration increased 14%.
Students with disabilities had a federal index of 28% across all components.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

L25% ELA Learning Gains showed the lowest performance at 36%, Math Achievement at 40%, and ELA Achievement at 42%. Students with disabilities were at 14% for ELA achievement and 19% for Math achievement.

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 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. Additionally a change in ELA curriculum and instructional resources is a contributing factor for ELA performance and shows a need for more intensive support through Collaborative Learning and Planning and instructional coaching.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on 2022 data, MS Acceleration increased by 24%, L25% Math increased by 17%, Social Studies achievement increased by 16%, and Math Learning Gains increased by 12%.

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

A contributing factor for improvement was an increase in afterschool tutoring for Algebra, L25% Math, and Civics. Additionally, L25% Math students were targeted for small group instruction including unit assessment data chats and increased progress monitoring within iReady.

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

New Math Curriculum will be used.
Math Coach 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 and Math curriculum and BEST Standards.
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.

A Math Coach will be added.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Standards based unit lesson planning using the collaborative learning and planning cycle to increase proficiency in instructional practice and student achievement. Analysis of student achievement data indicates L25% and SWD are not achieving at the same rate as nondisabled higher achieving peers in reading and math.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	ELA Achievement will increase to 50% (+8%) Math Achievement will increase to 45% (+5%) Social Studies Achievement will increase to 77% (+3%) Science Achievement will increase to 45% (+5%) MS Acceleration will increase to 75% (+1%) SWD federal index will increase to 41% (+13%)
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Progress monitoring will occur after each instructional unit in ELA, Science and Social Studies or cumulative assessments in Math. FAST progress monitoring will occur three times a year. Collaborative learning and planning sessions to be monitored through CLP observation, classroom observation and feedback cycles.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teacher collaboration as a school-wide approach for teacher planning for standards-based instruction. 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) is an investment in peer-to-peer professional development. It is an opportunity for teachers to teach and learn from one another for the pedagogical effectiveness as they work toward ensuring that students make learning gains. Through the CLP process teachers collaborate on identifying learning targets, planning for instruction, analyzing student work/formative assessments, and differentiation to meet the needs for all students.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Establish a school-wide collaborative learning and planning schedule to include full day planning and before/after school.

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

Literacy and Math Coach will provide support during collaborative learning and planning sessions, as well as during classroom instruction.

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

Implement use of district provided resources during Collaborative Learning and Planning

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

Coaches and administration will provide actionable feedback to teachers regarding CLP and classroom observations.

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

Literacy classroom walkthrough tool will be used for observation and feedback

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Culture and Learning Environment for students and staff.	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	School Climate and Culture including Early Warning Systems. Analysis of teacher survey results, student survey data, student discipline data, as well as staff and student attendance indicate a need to address the culture and learning environment needs of the school.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Panorama favorable ratings for School Climate will increase by 7%. Panorama favorable ratings for Sense of Belonging will increase by 5%. Teacher and staff personal well being will increase by 5%. Teacher favorable ratings for School Climate will increase by 5%. Student office discipline referrals for Level 3 offenses will decrease by 10%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The culture and learning environment will be monitored through the student and teacher surveys at least two times a year. Additionally, teacher and staff wellbeing will be monitored daily through a daily poll. Student office discipline referrals will be monitored monthly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	A strong Tier 1 for behavior and culture and learning environment will be implemented to teach students the five competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. Attention to adult well-being will be addressed to support the culture and learning environment of the school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for	A strong Tier 1 behavior plan to address the school's culture and learning environment will have a direct effect on student achievement. Intentional focus on CLE competencies is a proven strategy to reduce discipline concerns, increase attendance, and develop positive learning communities. Adult CLE is designed to encourage self-care to increase personal well-being to build resiliency and self-regulation as models for students and to build depth and capacity in staff in order for them to effectively support the culture and learning environment for students.

selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create a school-wide Tier 1 behavior plan to include Single School Culture and school-wide classroom management plans.

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

Implement district's iSucceed initiative through Single School Culture and initiate student success meetings with school discipline officer to support Tier 2 behavior interventions.

Person Responsible	David Pierce (david.pierce@stlucieschools.org)

Implement Tier 1 for Culture and Learning environment.

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

Implement monitoring of adult perception of school culture and learning environment through daily check-ins.

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

Support teacher and staff well-being through staff activities, recognition, and rewards.

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

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Foundational skills planning for small group and MTSS time to increase proficiency in instructional practice and student achievement in Reading/ELA.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Foundational skills planning for small group and MTSS time to increase proficiency in instructional practice and student achievement in Reading/ELA.

Standards based unit lesson planning using the collaborative learning and planning cycle to increase proficiency in instructional practice and student achievement in Reading/ELA.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

2022 Spring iReady Diagnostic Phonics Proficiency
Grade K- 90%
Grade 1- 54%
Grade 2- 58%

Current First Grade will remain at 90% and current Second Grade will increase to 70% for Phonics proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

2022 ELA/Reading Data Proficiency
Grade 3- 39%
Grade 4- 40%
Grade 5- 37%

Grades 3, 4, and 5 will increase to 51% proficiency in ELA/Reading.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

K-2 progress monitoring will occur two times a year through iReady Diagnostic testing.

Grades 3-5 progress monitoring will occur after each instructional unit in ELA. FAST progress monitoring will occur three times a year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lee, Jaclyn, jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

What Works Clearinghouse Foundational Skills Practice Guide provides four recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills to students in kindergarten through 3rd grade. Each recommendation includes implementation steps and solutions for common obstacles. The recommendations also summarize and rate supporting evidence. This guide is geared towards teachers, administrators, and other educators who want to improve their students' foundational reading skills, and is a companion to the practice guide, Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade.

What Works Clearinghouse Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9 Practice Guide provides four evidence-based recommendations that teachers can use to deliver reading interventions to meet the needs of their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The practice guides will provide professional learning around effective foundational skill practices that will transfer into quality classroom instruction. There is strong evidence that these practices have a sound record of effectiveness.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy leadership team will provide the professional development, support in data analysis and resource alignment to increase teacher knowledge and implementation.	Martin, Amber, amber.martin@stlucieschools.org
Continued progress monitoring and literacy walks to provide feedback and support continuous growth.	Martin, Amber, amber.martin@stlucieschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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.

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

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.

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.