

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Oak Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Oak Park Elementary School

2716 N 46TH ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[ no web address on file ]

### 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.

Everyone learns every day.

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

Preparing Students for Life

### 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
Moody, Ryan	Principal	Supervisor of all day-to-day processes on campus. He is also the lead instructional specialist, runs the budget, and gives all final evaluations on teachers and staff.
Lavey, Alysha	Instructional Coach	SAC Chair ELA Instructional Coach- planning, data chats. content PLCs, and student intervention groups
Snapp, Cindy	Instructional Coach	Math Instructional Coach- planning, data chats. content PLCs, and student intervention groups

#### 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.

The faculty and SAC team meet to improve and/or revise the SIP based on students needs.

#### 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))

All members of the School Leadership Team will monitor classrooms and/or planning sessions to ensure the implementation and fidelity of our areas of focus.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 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>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	96%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<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 (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B  2019-20: F  2018-19: F  2017-18: F
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

### 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	28	25	22	35	21	22	0	0	0	153	
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	5	9	0	0	0	20	
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	33	25	27	0	0	0	85	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	14	17	0	0	0	60	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	20	20	29	14	17	0	0	0	110	

**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	10	20	20	29	14	17	0	0	0	110

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	3	16	9	9	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

### 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	28	25	22	35	21	22	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	5	9	0	0	0	20
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	33	25	27	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	14	17	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	20	20	29	14	17	0	0	0	110

**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	10	20	20	29	14	17	0	0	0	110

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	3	16	9	9	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

## 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*	30	50	53	27	53	56	24		
ELA Learning Gains				54			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				72			67		
Math Achievement*	50	56	59	49	50	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				74			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				82			74		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	15	50	54	22	59	59	30		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	46	59	59				69		

\* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	168
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	1	1
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	33	Yes	1	

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	57			
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	54			

**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	30			50			15					46
SWD	31			81			7				3	
ELL											1	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			48			10				4	
HSP	31			69							3	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	31			49			15				5	40

## 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	27	54	72	49	74	82	22					
SWD	36	48	73	77	85		20					
ELL	33			46								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	53	72	46	75	85	17					
HSP	38	73		60	93							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	27	54	74	49	74	81	22					

## 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	24	55	67	43	71	74	30					69
SWD	24	56		50	69		42					
ELL	42	40		50	60							69

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	58	75	43	76	71	27					
HSP	38	50		43								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	24	55	69	43	72	76	30					73

### 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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	24%	53%	-29%	54%	-30%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	58%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	24%	46%	-22%	50%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	46%	55%	-9%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	13%	47%	-34%	51%	-38%

### 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.**

-

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

-

**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.**

-

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

-

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

-

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

-

#### Area of Focus

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

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****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.

In 2019 only 24% of students were proficient in Reading. Furthermore, In 2019, only 43% of students made gains in Reading. It is evident that small group instruction is needed to provide access to and acceleration of grade level content.

Rationale: >99% Free and Reduced Lunch

Our school boundaries include 6 hotel/motel, 2 domestic violence shelters, and 1 drug/alcohol rehab facility. Our students come to school having experienced varying levels of trauma without strategies for managing and coping.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students with one or more suspensions will decrease from 5% to 4%

**Monitoring:**

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

The RTI-B Resource teacher will meet weekly with Student Services team to analyze behavior data from Live School and Behavior Trackers.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**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.)

1. Proactive Talking Circles during Morning Meeting, 2. Positive Behavior Support through Live School and House Systems.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Eric Jensen, students in poverty who have experienced trauma thrive in systems that provide consistent and reliable structures. He also states that students must be taught how to interact and cope to achieve success.

**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 1 - Strong 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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to****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.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Monitoring:**

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**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.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**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 1 - Strong 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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

-

**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**

Description: Employ high-leverage instructional practices/structures that allow students to master grade-level benchmarks/standards. Emphasis will be placed on supporting teachers in planning and implementing high-quality small-group instruction. This assistance will particularly target instructional approaches that encourage active student participation in the learning process, along with tier 2 instruction to bridge the achievement gap and attain proficiency in grade-level benchmarks.

Rationale: Historical data shows that Oak Park students struggle to meet proficiency targets in ELA, Math, and Science. According to 2023 FAST PM3 results, 31% of students were proficient in ELA and 52% of students were proficient in Math. According to 2023 FSSA results, 17% of students were proficient in Science. Oak Park has established a robust foundation for the core instruction through regular common planning sessions, professional learning communities (PLCs), and coaching assistance. While the core instruction is well-established, it is important to supplement it with high-quality small group instruction to reinforce the core concepts and guide students towards achieving proficiency in grade-level benchmarks. Teachers continue to demonstrate a need for support in the area of small group instruction.

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

Description: Employ high-leverage instructional practices/structures that allow students to master grade-level benchmarks/standards. Emphasis will be placed on supporting teachers in planning and implementing high-quality small-group instruction. This assistance will particularly target instructional approaches that encourage active student participation in the learning process, along with tier 2 instruction to bridge the achievement gap and attain proficiency in grade-level benchmarks.

Rationale: Historical data shows that Oak Park students struggle to meet proficiency targets in ELA, Math, and Science. According to 2023 FAST PM3 results, 31% of students were proficient in ELA and 52% of students were proficient in Math. According to 2023 FSSA results, 17% of students were proficient in Science. Oak Park has established a robust foundation for the core instruction through regular common planning sessions, professional learning communities (PLCs), and coaching assistance. While the core instruction is well-established, it is important to supplement it with high-quality small group instruction to reinforce the core concepts and guide students towards achieving proficiency in grade-level benchmarks. Teachers continue to demonstrate a need for support in the area of small group instruction.

## 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 October 2023, at least 95% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data. By December 2023, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data.

This will result in grades 3-5 FAST/FSSA proficiency scores increasing in ELA, Math, and Science (see breakdown below):

-Increase ELA proficiency from 31% to 40%

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By October 2023, at least 95% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data. By December 2023, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data.

This will result in grades 3-5 FAST/FSSA proficiency scores increasing in ELA, Math, and Science (see breakdown below):

-Increase ELA proficiency from 31% 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.

School administration team will regularly attend weekly common planning and PLC sessions to ensure planning and teacher support are in alignment with teacher needs in the focus area of small group instruction. In addition, walkthrough look-for trend data will be collected and shared with teachers regularly.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Moody, Ryan, ryan.moody@hcps.net

## 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 evidenced-based strategy being used to support this area of focus is Teacher Clarity. According to John Hattie’s Visible Learning Indicators, strong Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75, which falls in the “Zone of Desired Effects”. Teacher Clarity is described as helping students gauge their own progress through the use of success criteria, and intentional and deliberate feedback. In addition, strong teacher clarity is evident when the teacher and students are partners in explaining the intended learning targets.

**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 evidenced-based strategy was selected to support the target area of focus because with strong teacher clarity on all learning targets (both core and small group instruction), students will be more in alignment with their own learning goals. In addition, according to John Hattie’s research, actions falling in the range of 0.40 and above, learning extends beyond that which was expected from attending school for one school year. Due to the significant gaps our students demonstrate, we need to employ evidence-based strategies that will support larger than one year’s growth.

**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
Teachers will be provided with personalized in-classroom coaching that focusses on addressing their unique needs, their identified tier, and the school improvement plan. By analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data, the appropriate coaching support, and tiers for teachers will be determined. Identified teachers will be provided specific coaching in the outlined area of focus: small group instruction.	Moody, Ryan, ryan.moody@hcps.net
Teachers will engage in weekly common planning periods and (content PLCs/unit internalizations) facilitated by a coach or lead teacher. Based on identified teacher caseloads, weekly common planning periods and ongoing (content PLCs/unit internalization sessions) will be facilitated by identified coaches.	Moody, Ryan, ryan.moody@hcps.net
Teachers will participate in coach/teacher-lead facilitated ongoing formative and summative Data Chats. Data Chats will include an analysis of various assessment data sets, student work, and action planning for future instruction.	Moody, Ryan, ryan.moody@hcps.net

## 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.

Printouts are placed in a binder in the front office, information is placed on the school website, and passed out at SAC meetings.

<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/oakpark>

**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))

Open House, Parent Teacher Conference, Family Night, Black History Month Program, Hispanic Heritage Month Program

**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)**

Community circles will be utilized in every classroom at the beginning of every day, house systems will be utilized, and a schoolwide incentivization program through Live School will be utilized to provide a positive

**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))**

-

#### **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))**

-

**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))**

-

**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).**

-

**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))**

-

**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))**

-