

Broward County Public Schools

# Oakland Park Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (44%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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**

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
Garcia, Michelle	Principal	To provide instructional, organizational, professional and ethical leadership. Develop and maintain positive school/community relations by promoting/marketing the school and its priorities to the community served.
Brown, Tranya	Assistant Principal	To provide instructional, organizational, professional and ethical leadership. Develop and maintain positive school/community relations by promoting/marketing the school and its priorities to the community served.
burton, matthew	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Support school improvement and student achievement by providing Push-in/ Pull-out support to students needing intervention or remediation.
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.
duncan, heidi	Teacher, K-12	Provides Kindergarten grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction 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.
Oren , Daniel	Teacher, K-12	Provides Second grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and student achievement.
Price, Rosemary	Teacher, K-12	Provides First 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.
Vazquez, Cari	Teacher, K-12	Provides Third grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and 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.
Kirkland, Rayscene	Teacher, K-12	Provides Fifth grade level input in decisions that affect curriculum, instruction and student achievement.

### Demographic Information



**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2012, Michelle Garcia

**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.*

2

**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.*

5

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

24

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

572

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

1

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

5

**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	78	104	88	82	77	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	65	51	46	29	34	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	11	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	17	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
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	19	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	0	0	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/6/2022

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	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	

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	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	

## 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	58%	58%	56%				50%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	75%						67%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	82%						80%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	54%	50%				41%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						51%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	81%						48%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	59%	59%				18%	46%	53%

### 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	64%	60%	4%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	62%	-24%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	59%	-26%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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	43%	65%	-22%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	31%	67%	-36%	64%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	64%	-28%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	17%	49%	-32%	53%	-36%
Cohort Comparison						

### 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	31	59		17	46	90	18				
ELL	54	72	79	32	60	79	33				
BLK	57	82	100	33	55	92	23				
HSP	57	69	71	35	58	74	33				
WHT	75	90		69	60						
FRL	63	75	89	38	55	95	34				
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						
FRL	49	68	83	39	49	49	17				

### 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
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	55
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	74
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	62
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 K-2 gains were made from beginning to end of the year on the Oral Reading Records. Students, including those in our ELL and ESE subgroups, that struggled with fluency could be attributed to gaps in phonics attainment. Based on FSA data, we saw an overall increase in reading proficiency for grades 3, 4, and 5. The weakest area in reading was the integration of knowledge domain. In tracking students from grades 4 to 5 on the FSA Writes the percentage of students scoring a 6-10 increased from 34% to 66%.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, our 4th grade ELA proficiency levels demonstrate 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?

One contributing factor to Oakland Park's need for improvement in 4th ELA proficiency was the introduction of the text based writing component. With the transition from LAFS to BEST the progress monitoring for 3rd to 4th grade will include writing using similar prompts and rubrics.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, 5th grade ELA proficiency scores saw the most improvement going from 34% to 63% scoring a 3 or better with 32% of those students scoring a level 4 or 5.

#### 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 to 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 that need to be implemented to accelerate learning are ESSR teachers providing push-in support to help remediate/enrich standards taught, targeted professional development, and recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers.

**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.**

Professional development activities geared toward literacy:

Literacy Pro

F.I.R.S.T.

Benchmark e-assessments

**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

Alignment of resources in ELA, Math, and Science

On-going progress monitoring in ELA, Math and Science

FAST and Benchmark Unit assessments data analysis of sub-groups

**Areas of Focus**

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

:



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The students with disabilities subgroup was identified as a critical need area based on data showing that 31% of students in this subgroup met proficiency levels in English Language Arts.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By June 2023, Oakland Park Elementary plans to increase the proficiency level of the students with disabilities from 0% to 25% based on student performance on the FAST ELA Reading test PM3.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Our area of focus will be monitored with fidelity through Benchmark Advance weekly and unit assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

dawn mcMahon (dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence-based strategies being implemented in ELA is targeted small group instruction and strategic intervention using the Horizons reading program.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The Horizon Reading Intervention Program was selected based on the components of the program aligned to the Science of Reading.

**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.

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)

**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**

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, there are approximately 42% of students in grades K-2 who are not on track to score level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment. With an ever growing ELL population in this grade band phonics has been identified as an area of critical need.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, our 4th grade ELA proficiency levels demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Grade 4 was the only grade level with more than 50% of students scoring below a level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

**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)**

By June 2023, based on data from the 2021-2022 end of year screening and 2022-2023 beginning of the year progress monitoring, the number of students scoring on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment in 2nd grade will increase from 49% to 54%.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By June 2023, based on data from the 2022 state ELA assessments, the number of 4th grade students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2023 state ELA assessment will increase from 46% to 50%.

**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.

The progression of 4th grade students achieving proficiency or better will be monitored through Benchmark advance weekly and unit assessments, along with charting growth through the state's FAST ELA Reading progress monitoring assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

mcmahon, dawn, dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com

**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?

The evidence-based program utilized in the Florida Benchmark Advance curriculum. This program is used for all aspects of ELA, including interventions and Writing.

- Benchmark Advanced strongly meets the Florida definition of an evidence-based program.
- Benchmark Advanced aligned with Broward County's K-12 Reading Plan
- Benchmark Advanced aligned to the B.E.S.T standards, meeting all ELA Standards, Strands and Expectations.

**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?

This program addresses all areas of reading, for all grade levels.

- Broward County has an adoption committee and are only allowed to use programs with proven records for 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
<p>Identified students will receive small group pull out instruction in phonics delivered by our ESSR teacher and teachers from the Innovation Learning Grant. The Literacy Team will meet multiple times throughout the year to discuss a variety of reading topics such as cross curricula, strengths/weaknesses, and best practices. The Literacy Coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs and observations, providing feedback to the teachers, and offering classroom support where needed. The FAST and Benchmark Advance Unit tests will be used to progress monitor the students throughout the year. Data meetings will be held regularly to discuss the students' progress and to help drive both upcoming curriculum and remediation. Staff will receive training on the Benchmark Universe e-assessments and the state's FAST progress monitoring sites. These trainings will address assigning assessments, pulling and understanding Benchmark Universe and FAST progress monitoring reports, along with utilizing the information to drive the curriculum.</p>	<p>mcmahon, dawn, dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com</p>
<p>Identified students in 4th grade will receive targeted instruction by the ESSR and Resource teacher based on data from the state's beginning of the year assessment. The Literacy Team will meet multiple times throughout the year to discuss a variety of reading topics such as cross curricula, strengths/weaknesses, and best practices. The Literacy Coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs and observations, providing feedback to the teachers, and offering classroom support where needed. The FAST and Benchmark Advance Unit tests will be used to progress monitor the students throughout the year. Data meetings will be held regularly to discuss the students' progress and to help drive both upcoming curriculum and remediation. Staff will receive training on the Benchmark Universe e-assessments and the state's FAST progress monitoring sites. These trainings will address assigning assessments, pulling and understanding Benchmark Universe and FAST progress monitoring reports, along with utilizing the information to drive the curriculum.</p>	<p>mcmahon, dawn, dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com</p>

## **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.**

Oakland Park Elementary fosters 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 school culture and environment.**

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.