

Broward County Public Schools

Oakland Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Oakland Park Elementary School

936 NE 33RD ST, Oakland Park, FL 33334

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

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.
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.
walker, ricky	Math Coach	Responsible for monitoring the mathematics curriculum. Provides mathematics modeling and support to teachers to increase teacher efficacy 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.
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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our processes for involving stakeholders in the School Improvement Plan is done through School Advisory Council. The School Advisory Council is composed of leadership, teachers, parents, school staff and business/community partners. The School Advisory Council meets every month to discuss school improvement goals.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school Improvement plan is monitored monthly through the School Advisory Council meetings. During the meetings, administration discuss school improvement data with all stakeholders and discuss the school's pathway to increasing student achievement. The SIP is a fluid document and can/will be adjusted based on the needs of students in mastering the standards/goals.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	47	41	42	27	18	26	0	0	0	201
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	3	6	0	0	0	15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	23	29	38	44	29	36	0	0	0	199
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	22	40	31	33	49	0	0	0	175
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	4	4	46	15	13	0	0	0	83

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	15	24	42	48	29	47	0	0	0	205

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	9	1	5	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	65	51	46	29	34	23	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	11	27	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	17	37	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	19	17	27	0	0	0	63

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	18	1	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	65	51	46	29	34	23	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	11	27	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	17	37	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	19	17	27	0	0	0	63

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	18	1	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	29	56	53	58	58	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				75			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				82			100		
Math Achievement*	29	62	59	36	54	50	32		
Math Learning Gains				56			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				81			63		
Science Achievement*	42	48	54	34	59	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	59	59	42			35		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	188
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	1	1
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	34	Yes	1	
FRL	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	29			29			42					59
SWD	17			17							4	36
ELL	21			24			38				5	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			27			44				5	65
HSP	28			30			46				5	58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42			25							2	
FRL	34			31			43				5	59

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	58	75	82	36	56	81	34					42
SWD	31	59		17	46	90	18					27
ELL	54	72	79	32	60	79	33					42
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	57	82	100	33	55	92	23					40
HSP	57	69	71	35	58	74	33					42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	90		69	60							
FRL	63	75	89	38	55	95	34					48

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	50	58	100	32	36	63	33					35
SWD	35	27		29	40		36					17
ELL	52	67	100	32	44	67	32					35
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52	59		31	35		37					32
HSP	47	60	100	33	39		31					36
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	49	57	100	31	38	62	35					38

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	26%	56%	-30%	54%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	25%	53%	-28%	50%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	39%	62%	-23%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	30%	65%	-35%	61%	-31%
05	2023 - Spring	18%	58%	-40%	55%	-37%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	46%	-10%	51%	-15%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on data from last year's PM 3 FAST testing, Math in K-5 was the component with the lowest performance. Factors contributing to this low performance are the introduction of a new textbook series, shift from LAFS to BEST standards in grades 3-5, and the change in the assessment platform.

Last year with the adoption of the Envision math series, teachers underwent continuous training during the school year on its numerous components and the ways to best utilize them within the classroom. This unfamiliarity with the instructional resources may have led to ineffective usage of the lesson components.

Another contributing factor is the transition in grades 3 -5 from the LAFS to the BEST standards. During the 21-22 school year, teachers in the intermediate grades were responsible for introducing students to the BEST standards, but the LAFS took priority as they were the focus of that year's state test. The transition to the BEST standards in the 22-23 school year increased any already present student learning gaps in grades 4-5.

The last contributing factor was the introduction of the FAST assessment platforms. For students in grades 3-5, it was the first time taking a high stakes test using an online platform. Students in grades 4 and 5 had previously taken the paper-based FSA. While the question types were similar to the paper-

based assessment some students experienced difficulty transitioning their answers from paper to online and remembering how to use the various tools to represent answers accurately.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was ELA which went down from 58% proficiency to 36% proficiency. Factors contributing to the decline were changes in standards and assessment design and platform, gaps in learning within the 4th and 5th grade students, and a large ELL population.

Last year was the first-year teachers were delving into the BEST standards in grades 3-5. Along with instructing students they were familiarizing themselves with the new standards and determining the best instructional strategies to utilize for closing learning gaps, especially in grades 4 & 5. Teachers were also in their second year of utilizing the new Benchmark Advance reading series coupled with implementing BEST standards. Which may have played a role in the effectiveness in choosing appropriate resources to address the extra learning gaps for students within grades 4 & 5 caused by the standards shift.

The students in grades 4 and 5 also had large population of ELL students scoring in the level 1 & 2 areas on the previous year's ACCESS for ELLs test.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Again, the data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA. Just as with the decline in yearly performance the contributing factors were changes in standards and assessments, gaps in learning within the 4th and 5th grade students, a large ELL population.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement was Science. During the 22-23 school year, we implemented a school-wide science strand focus, made the lowest strands of Nature of Science and Life Science priorities, monitored the implementation of 5E lessons, carried out Mad Science Fridays, conducted bi-weekly 5th grade Science Bowl competitions, and sponsored science field trips.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The first area of concern is student attendance. Last year, almost 38% of the students K-5 were absent 10 or more days. The second area of concern is the number of students scoring a level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment. In K-5 there was a total of 199 students scoring a level 1 during the 22-23 school year.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math proficiency
3. Science proficiency
4. ELA learning gains
5. Math learning gains

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data from the 2023 FAST PM 3 reading assessment showed that overall proficiency rates in grades 3-5 took a decline of 22%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or higher will move to 40% proficiency by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of the desired outcome will occur through FAST progress monitoring three times a year, i-Ready diagnostic assessments three times a year, and periodic i-Ready growth monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

dawn mcmahon (dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The district evidence-based intervention programs being utilized at Oakland Park Elementary are i-Ready, I station, Imagine Language & Literacy, and the Benchmark Advance intervention resource. The teachers are also using the SIPPS phonics program as a supplemental intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs were selected for us through the Broward County School Board.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 the ESSR teacher
 Progress monitoring of standards mastered and those that need remediation

The Reading Coach is responsible for ensuring that small group instruction is happening every day 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)

By When: By June 2024.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 the STAR/Early Literacy PM3 assessments: 33% of the Kindergarten students, 59% of the First-grade students and 35% of our Second-grade students are At/Above grade level expectation. In addition to this assessment, progress monitoring in Benchmark Advance was also utilized. 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 related to Reading/ELA

Based on the F.A.S.T. PM3 assessments: 25% of the third-grade students, 38% of the fourth-grade students and 27% of our fifth-grade students are proficient at a level 3-5. In addition to this assessment, progress monitoring in Benchmark Advance was also utilized. All three grades had lower proficiency rates than in the past. The subcategory of Reading Across Genres/Vocabulary was identified as weaker across grade levels.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, based on data from the STAR 2023 PM 3 assessment, the number of students scoring on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment in 2nd grade will increase from 35% to 45%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, based on data from the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. ELA assessment, the number of 3rd grade students scoring a level 3 or above will increase from 25% to 40%.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The progression of 3rd grade students achieving proficiency or better will be monitored through Benchmark advance unit assessments, along with charting growth through the state's F.A.S.T. 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

Description:

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. §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 is 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 to the B.E.S.T standards, meeting all ELA Standards, Strands and Expectations.

iReady will also be utilized for practice and benchmark interventions. This evidence-based program is aligned with all of the state standards in Reading.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based 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 instruction in phonics delivered by our ESSR teacher and teachers from the Chapter One Tutoring program. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Staff will receive training on the Science of Reading. These trainings will address changes in the implementation of the 90-minute reading block. District support will be assisting with training and follow up support.</p>	<p>mcmahon, dawn, dawn.mcmahon@browardschools.com</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Dissemination of the school improvement plan occurs during School Advisory Council meetings, via the school's webpage: <https://www.browardschools.com/Page/49968?schoolnumber=0031>, and a print copy is kept in the front office for stakeholder viewing or copying by request.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Several parent engagement events have been scheduled throughout the year to build positive community relationships. The first event occurred before the beginning of school with our Teacher Meet & Greet. It was followed up by our Annual Open House where we partnered with our district's ESOL department to also host an ELL parent information night. Upcoming events planned are four ESOL game nights, each focusing on one of the four academic competencies ELA, Math, Science, or Social Studies. Communication of these events takes place through announcements on the school's website, front marquee, advance flyers, and Parent link calls, texts, and emails.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

O.P.E.'s Title One budget has allocated funds to purchase additional Reading, Math and Science materials to assist our students strengthen academic areas. We are also implementing the Science of Reading this year and a 30-minute double dose time during the school year. We are starting our after-school tutoring in October to give our students additional instructional time.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers participate in professional development linked to improved student achievement and specific school improvement goals. Teacher will participate in TLAC Strategies, Science of Reading, Math and Science trainings, and ESL Strategies. These trainings are all to support student achievement.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Oakland Park Elementary School services five classes of Specialized PreK ESE (formerly Preschool Learning Activities Classroom Experience-PLACE) and two Head Start class. The teachers conduct vertical articulation meetings during the school year to ensure that the transition from the early childhood programs to kindergarten program is smooth. A Kindergarten Orientation is also held prior to the beginning of the school year. This gives the incoming kindergarten students an opportunity to meet their new teacher and get acclimated to their classroom. Additionally, parents are given an overview of the kindergarten curriculum and expectations.