

Orange County Public Schools

# Oak Hill Elementary



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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Oak Hill Elementary

11 S HIAWASSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://oakhilles.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Cicely Marks**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

<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: C (48%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (39%)
<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>	TSI

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Oak Hill Elementary

11 S HIAWASSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://oakhilles.ocps.net/>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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.**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### 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
Marks, Cicely	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader and is responsible for the overall performance of the school, teacher evaluations, and continual monitoring of the School Improvement Plan with the involvement of the School Advisory Committee.
Nye, Michelle	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal monitors the development of lesson plans through common planning and ensures standards are being implemented accurately according to B.E.S.T benchmark clarifications/expectations, item specs, etc., assists in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan and conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations providing evaluative and non-evaluative feedback.
Mohamed, Roshan	Instructional Coach	
Castor, Nicole	Math Coach	The Math Coach facilitates the implementation of math programs, activities, and strategies designed to achieve school improvement objectives. In addition, the Math Coach is responsible for conducting coaching cycles, modeling lessons and providing non-evaluative walkthrough feedback.
Weaver-Baker, Terica	School Counselor	Provides support and guidance in meeting the overall needs of students. Conducts MTSS-related meetings as needed, for the purposes of intervention, parent communication, and student guidance.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 6/15/2020, Cicely Marks

**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.*

0

**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.*

27

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

27

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

440

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

3

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

4

**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	27	68	66	77	54	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
Attendance below 90 percent	6	19	17	18	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	17	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	21	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	10	15	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

**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	10	15	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/5/2022

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	66	66	67	64	76	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	16	19	31	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	66	66	67	64	76	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	16	19	31	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	1	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

**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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	44%	56%	56%				47%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						44%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	24%						31%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	46%	50%				59%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						62%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						39%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	61%	59%				42%	56%	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	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

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	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	63%	-11%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	53%	-16%
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	7	19	15	11	52	36	17				
ELL	39	51	26	42	64	50	55				
BLK	46	56	18	43	66	50	54				
HSP	42	57	31	48	60	43	61				
WHT	36	36		36	82						
FRL	43	53	21	41	65	53	57				
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	12			12							
ELL	23	50	58	36	44		17				
ASN	90			100							
BLK	49	52		50	33		61				
HSP	33	46		34	26		45				
WHT	29			21							
FRL	41	51	50	37	26	27	44				
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	14	35	25	9	35	29					
ELL	43	47	25	59	66	45	31				
BLK	47	42	28	57	60	38	44				
HSP	43	50	35	53	63	42	31				
WHT	53	50		82	75						
FRL	45	46	35	55	58	35	47				

**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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
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
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	48
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	50
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?**

When examining 2021-2022 FSA proficiency data, overall ELA and Math proficiency data remained constant showing an increase of 1% in ELA proficiency and 2% in Math. ELA learning gains increased by 2% while ELA learning gains amongst the lowest quartile experienced a 37% decrease. Conversely, Math learning gains increased by 36% while Math learning gains amongst the lowest quartile increased by 14%. In addition, Science proficiency increased by 4%.

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

Based on 2021/2022 FSA data and 2020/2021 end-of-year i-Ready results, the data component that showed the lowest performance was the lowest 25% learning gains in ELA. Data in this category from the past three years show this to be a trend.

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

The contributing factors were the limited time spent teaching foundational reading skills in addition to planning for and executing differentiated small group instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was overall Math learning gains and Math learning gains amongst the lowest quartile. 29% of students in 2020-2021, made learning gains in math compared to 67% showing increases in 2021-2022. End of the year i-Ready Math diagnostic results reflect 52% proficiency which is an increase of 33% from the beginning of the year.

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

New actions that were taken in this area include: adjusting the math block to include whole group and small group instruction, math intervention five days a week in addition to math acceleration and math tutoring before and after school.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, Oak Hill will continue with the implementation of Acceleration as a means to preview standards prior to being presented during the planned scope and sequence. The Acceleration model will also be used as the structure for after school tutoring.

**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.**

All classroom teachers in addition to resource team members will be trained in the use of Acceleration as a means of strategically preparing students for success by delving into new concepts. In addition, intense professional development will be provided in the use of the newly adopted Math curriculum.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement will include: the use of engagement strategies to increase cognitive engagement, Tier I interventionist to support small group instruction as well as intervention block, and targeted tutoring for students in the lowest quartile. In addition, students scoring in the top quartile will participating in enrichment two times per week.

**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:** Three year trend data shows minimum increases in overall Reading and Math proficiency. Minimum schoolwide increases in proficiency indicates a need to examine core instruction delivery, while developing an authentic understanding of the new B.E.S.T standards in Reading and Math. A focus on instructional practice specifically related to B.E.S.T standards will ensure that instruction is appropriately aligned and delivered.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable Outcome:** By increasing the effectiveness of instructional delivery, proficiency in ELA will increase from 44% to 51%, learning gains will increase from 53% to 60% and learning gains amongst the bottom quartile will increase from 24% to 60%. Math proficiency will increase from 45% to 51%, learning gains will increase from 65% to 70% and learning gains amongst the lowest quartile will increase from 51% to 60%.  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

**Monitoring:** Standards based unit assessments, Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA 1,2,3), Intervention data and Classroom Walkthrough data will be utilized to monitor the effectiveness of Instructional Practice specifically related to the B.E.S.T standards.  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will effectively implement the BEST standards schoolwide. Teachers will utilize the Art and Science of Teaching in addition to the instructional framework to deliver instruction that is both standards based and cognitively engaging.  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Focusing on instructional practice specifically related to the BEST standards schoolwide will ensure that all classrooms have the same expectations and all students are receiving high quality standards based instruction.  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for 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.

All instructional staff will engage in a series of professional development aimed at B.E.S.T benchmark clarifications, vertical alignment and whole and small group instruction. In addition, professional development will be provided in the following areas: vertical progression of Reading and Math standards, writing across the curriculum and the use of digital resources.

**Person Responsible** Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)



Based on classroom walkthrough data, teachers will be tiered and provided with coaching support based on need. Teachers identified as Tier III will go through a full coaching cycle in order to support growth in identified areas.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Castor (nicole.castor@ocps.net)

Common planning will be restructured to focus on instructional delivery, data based decision making along with "if-then" planning in order to effectively and efficiently respond to student outcomes.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Nye (michelle.nye@ocps.net)

An Intense focus will be placed on teaching foundational reading skills in Kindergarten through Second grade and remediation of foundational skills in Third through Fifth grade. In addition, teachers will be provided professional development on the Science of Teaching Reading in order to ensure

**Person Responsible** Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)

## 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

End of the year i-Ready diagnostic data indicated that 55% of Second-grade students are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Minimum schoolwide increases in proficiency indicate a need to develop awareness of the segments of sound and their links to letters, decoding and analyzing word parts and focus on core instruction delivery to include explicit instruction, guided practice and systematic phonics instruction.

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

Most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 65 percent of Third grade students and 56 percent of Fourth grade students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). Minimum increases in proficiency indicate a need to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds and how they connect to letters, teach students to decode words, analyze word parts and focus on core

instruction delivery to include explicit instruction, guided practice, and purposeful opportunities for students to apply and transfer foundational skills through activities for active engagement in Reading.

**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)**

The 2022-2023 Progress Monitoring Assessment 3 (PMA3) will show an increase in Second grade ELA proficiency from 45 percent to 51 percent.

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

The 2022-2023 FAST data will show an increase in Third grade ELA proficiency from 35 percent to 51 percent and Fourth grade proficiency from 44 percent to percent to 51%.

**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.

MTSS and Common Planning meetings will be utilized to monitor and analyze student data from the following data sources: PMA Diagnostics, SIPPS Mastery Assessment, Classroom Walkthroughs and Standards Based Unit Assessment data. Instructional adjustments will frequently occur based on student outcomes.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Marks, Cicely , [cicely.marks@ocps.net](mailto:cicely.marks@ocps.net)

**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?

Exposing student to on grade level text helps to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, write and recognize words. In addition, it ensures that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension.

**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 selected instructional practice has a strong level of evidence, as noted in the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding.

**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>Assessment - MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure students are appropriately identified and matched to appropriate interventions and intensity. Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team’s findings based on FAST, iReady diagnostic, District created Standards Based Unit Assessments, Foundational Unit Assessments and intervention data.</p>	<p>Marks, Cicely , cicely.marks@ocps.net</p>
<p>Professional Learning - Teachers will engage in a series of professional learning specifically surrounding the Science of Reading: Teaching Reading Foundations Across the ELA Block, literacy coaching, BEST standards and ELA Impact Series.</p>	<p>Nye, Michelle, 95847@ocps.net</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching - Literacy Coaches will attend monthly district coach meetings and ELA Impact professional development. Classroom walkthrough data, intervention data and standards based unit assessment data will be utilized to determine the focus of coaching cycles. Teachers will be provided with targeted feedback aimed at improving instructional practice as it relates to the delivery of ELA instruction.</p>	<p>Mohamed, Roshan, roshan.mohamed@ocps.net</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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, Oak Hill engages in ongoing professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, Oak Hill uses social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students.

OHES utilizes a school-wide behavior system (PBIS) to consistently reinforce positive behavior school-wide. An incentive program (Character Club) for school culture in Character Education has been established which honors one student from each class who demonstrates the characteristics of the character word of the month. In addition, staff members have committed to participating in a staff-to-student relationship challenge which involves intentionally responding to various tasks in an effort to build relationships with students. Second Step SEL lessons are taught each week during the health block. In addition, SEL lessons surrounding the character word of the month are taught in each classroom by the guidance counselor.

Focusing on culture and environment specifically relating to Student Emotional Learning will allow us to integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen our school culture which will enable every

student to grow academically, socially, and emotionally. Building and establishing a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students is essential. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: academic growth, student attendance, and learning gains among our students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and lowest quartile students.

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

A core team of teachers, which includes a mental health designee, instructional and classified staff make up the core Life Skills team. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based initiatives focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Oak Hill strategically utilizes staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.