

Orange County Public Schools

Oak Hill 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Oak Hill Elementary

11 S HIAWASSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

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.

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, 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
Marks, Cicely	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader and is responsible for the overall performance of the school, teacher evaluations, continual monitoring of the School Improvement Plan, staff professional development, and the delivery of standards-based instruction.
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	Develops curriculum-related support materials, leads Curriculum Planning Team projects and teacher meetings, provides support for the unpacking of core content standards and programs, assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection and analysis, plans/ provides professional development, and school improvement plan implementation process.
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	The 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.
	Reading Coach	The primary responsibility of the reading coach is to facilitate the implementation of reading programs, activities, and strategies designed to achieve school improvement objectives.

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 School Improvement Plan is developed through collaboration with stakeholders including parents, teachers, staff, and community leaders. Stakeholder input is gathered through teacher, staff, and parent roundtable discussions. In addition, Panorama survey data is utilized to determine the area of focus based on feedback from parents, students, and staff.

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))

School Improvement Plan monitoring is a standard agenda item during bi-monthly School Advisory Council meetings and Faculty/Staff Meetings. Student outcomes on Progress Monitoring Assessments and Standards-Based Unit Assessments are constantly monitored and shared with stakeholders. Instructional adjustments are ongoing based on student outcomes.

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	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	5	8	16	14	19	10	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	3	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	
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	0	0	0	32	24	0	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	23	0	0	0	0	56	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	17	20	19	32	0	0	0	0	102	

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	3	6	8	37	21	0	0	0	75

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	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	6	19	17	18	18	22	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	17	31	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	21	29	0	0	0	60	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	10	15	30	0	0	0	55	

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	10	15	30	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	19	17	18	18	22	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	17	31	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	21	29	0	0	0	60	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	10	15	30	0	0	0	55	

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	10	15	30	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	48	57	53	44	56	56	43		
ELA Learning Gains				53			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				24			60		
Math Achievement*	51	60	59	45	46	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				65			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			43		
Science Achievement*	51	63	54	56	61	59	52		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	59	59	70			34		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	250
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	4	4
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	31	Yes	1	1
FRL	45			

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	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	51			

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	48			
FRL	50			

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	48			51			51					48
SWD	16			16							3	36
ELL	32			45			42				5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			47			60				5	50
HSP	41			53			38				5	47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	31			31							2	
FRL	46			48			46				5	39

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	44	53	24	45	65	51	56					70
SWD	7	19	15	11	52	36	17					57
ELL	39	51	26	42	64	50	55					70
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	46	56	18	43	66	50	54					69
HSP	42	57	31	48	60	43	61					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	36	36		36	82							
FRL	43	53	21	41	65	53	57					65

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	43	51	60	43	29	43	52					34
SWD	12			12								17
ELL	23	50	58	36	44		17					34
AMI												
ASN	90			100								
BLK	49	52		50	33		61					38
HSP	33	46		34	26		45					30
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	29			21								
FRL	41	51	50	37	26	27	44					25

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	46%	54%	-8%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	60%	-22%	58%	-20%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	59%	-21%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	62%	-12%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	55%	-2%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	59%	-15%	51%	-7%

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 2022-2023 preliminary FAST data and 2022-2023 iReady End of Year diagnostic data, the data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA proficiency with only 48 percent of students demonstrating proficiency in ELA. Although 48 percent ELA proficiency reflects a 4 percent increase from the previous year, data from the past three years shows this to be a trend. The contributing factors were the limited time spent teaching foundational reading skills in addition to planning for and executing small group instruction.

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

Based on 2022-2023 preliminary data, the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is science. This decrease is attributed to students' reading ability. There was a strong correlation between fifth-grade ELA reading proficiency and fifth-grade science proficiency.

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.

The component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is science. This gap is attributed to students' reading ability. There was a strong correlation between fifth-grade ELA reading proficiency and fifth-grade science proficiency.

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 overall math proficiency. The data indicates that 48% of students demonstrated proficiency in 2021-2022, compared to 54% demonstrating proficiency in 2022-2023. End of the year i-Ready Math diagnostic results reflect 52% proficiency which is an increase of 35% from the beginning of the year. 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.

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

When reflecting on EWS data, areas of concern are student attendance and the percentage of students scoring level 1 in ELA and math.

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

Based on Early Warning Systems and FAST data, Oak Hill Elementary School's highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming year will be increasing proficiency among our Students With Disabilities, increasing proficiency in science, and increasing overall ELA proficiency.

Area of Focus

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

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Oak Hill Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic monitoring strategies. There is a need to differentiate the small group instruction to support students in need of Tier II and Tier III MTSS support. Historically, students with disabilities have been an under-performing subgroup with a federal index score of 27% in 2021-2022. Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to continuously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces data-driven instruction, students with disabilities' individual needs will be met.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By increasing the effectiveness of standards based small group instruction, SWD proficiency in ELA will increase from 7% to 30%.

Monitoring:

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

MTSS and Common Planning meetings will be utilized to analyze and monitor student data from the following sources: FAST/STAR diagnostics, SIPPS Mastery Assessment, Standards Based Unit Assessments and Classroom Walkthrough data. Instructional adjustments will frequently occur based on student outcomes. Student data will serve as evidence that professional learning, coaching and feedback is effectively increasing student achievement in Reading and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

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.)

Teachers will effectively implement differentiated small group instruction for all students. FAST/STAR beginning of the year data along with SIPPS data will be utilized to identify deficiencies and monitor student progress. SIPPS, which is a researched, evidenced-based intervention, will be utilized during the Intervention block to address student deficiencies. Being a Reader will be used as the primary curricula for small group instruction at the teacher led station.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because teaching is focused precisely on individual student needs. Ongoing observation of students combined with systematic progress monitoring assessments enables teachers to form groups of students who fit a distinct instructional profile and address their specific needs.

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.

Instructional and support staff will be provided with professional learning to include: Being a Reader, Multisensory Learning and the Science of Reading and SIPPS.

Person Responsible: Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

Establish structures and expectations for small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block.

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

By When: August 2023

Teachers will maintain a data spreadsheet which includes student performance on standards based unit assessments, PMAs and intervention progress which will be used to make informed data based decisions.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Administration and Coaches will attend common planning meetings to assist with benchmark aligned tasks.

Person Responsible: Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Intense focus on foundational reading skills in Kindergarten through Second grade and remediation of foundational skills in Third-Fifth grade through the use of SOR and SIPPS

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

By When: May 2024

Teachers will be tiered based on iObservation and classroom walkthrough data and provided with coaching support and feedback through the coaching cycle.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Focusing on positive culture and environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems will allow us to integrate and monitor resources and strategies that will enable every student to grow academically, socially and emotionally. Establishing a culture which reflects a growth mindset 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 subject material. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture and environment, we will address the following student needs: attendance, proficiency, learning gains, retention and suspensions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With a focus on positive culture and school environment, the number of students with an attendance rate below 90% will decrease from 64 to 32. With a school-wide focus on character education, students' sense of belonging will increase from 72% to 77% and school safety will increase from 59% to 75%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will effectively implement the Second Step, which is a research based, evidence curriculum in addition to character education practices across curriculum areas and school-wide. Early warning systems indicators, classroom walkthrough trend data and Panorama survey results will be utilized to monitor the effectiveness of school-wide character education practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

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.)

Distributive leadership and social and emotional learning will be used to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. OHES will plan and implement professional learning on person first language and character development while offering opportunities for safe practice. Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS), a researched evidence-based intervention will be implemented school-wide. OHES will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessment, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by proficiency data, student needs and adult feedback survey responses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to achieve large scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the building. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational change and improvement. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, OHES can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional and academic development of every student.

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.

OHES will establish and utilize a school-wide behavior system (PBIS) to consistently reinforce positive behavior schoolwide.

Person Responsible: Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

An incentive program (Character Club) for school culture in Character Education will be established which honors one student from each class who demonstrates the characteristics of the character word of the month.

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

By When: August 2023

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.

Person Responsible: Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Second Step SEL lessons are taught each week during the health block.

Person Responsible: Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Character education lessons surrounding the character word of the month are taught in each classroom by the guidance counselor.

Person Responsible: Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

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).

Each year, school improvement funding and allocations are reviewed with the School Advisory Council and OHES staff. This review consists of presenting yearly budget allocations and explanation of expenditures to include both general and Title 1 funding. Stakeholders are given the opportunity to provide feedback and offer suggestions on proposed expenditures. In efforts to meet the needs of Students With Disabilities (ESSA subgroup below 41% index), funding has been allocated to purchase additional personnel to provide students with in-class support, resources and funding for extended learning opportunities beyond the school day.

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

End of the year i-Ready diagnostic data indicated that 53% of Kindergarten - 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 solidify foundational skills, develop awareness of the segments of sound and their links to letters, decode and analyze word parts and focus on core instruction delivery to include explicit instruction, guided practice and systematic phonics instruction.

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

Most recent FAST data indicated that 52% percent of third-grade students and 55% 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 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

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 Measurable Outcomes

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

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.

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem Solving Teams and Cadre leadership will be utilized to monitor and analyze student data from the following data sources: FAST, K-1 DIBELS, SIPSS progress monitoring data, and district created standards based unit assessments will be utilized to monitor response to intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Marks, Cicely , cicely.marks@ocps.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?

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

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?

The practices below meet ESSA strong level of evidence:

1. Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts and write and recognize words

2. Use of the comprehension pieces of the optional daily slides by routinely using a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text
3. Utilizing SIPPS to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words which will give students the ability to read complex multisyllabic words.
4. Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum assist students in developing awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters
5. OCPS Multisensory Kits - develops awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters
6. Exact Path

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership Teams - Monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	Marks, Cicely , cicely.marks@ocps.net
Literacy Coaching - Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, etc... to fit area(s) of need. Literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Mohamed, Roshan, roshan.mohamed@ocps.net
Assessment - Use and analysis of: -FAST -Heggerty Assessments -District created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades 2) -DIBELS (K-1) -Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3) -SIPPS Formative Data (K-5) Use of data to determine interventions and support needs of students	Nye, Michelle, michelle.nye@ocps.net
Professional Learning - Schools develop their professional learning plans based on the needs of their schools. These plans include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. District PD options available include the Instructional Literacy Institute, literacy coach meetings, K-5 ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction PD.	Marks, Cicely , cicely.marks@ocps.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.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be available on the "School Information" pull down menu of the school's website. In order to increase circulation, the school has shared the areas of focus, action steps, and measurable outcomes during an initial faculty meeting for the 2023-2024 school year. The SIP information is then presented to a joint School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meeting where parental input is gathered. Information about our school SIP, UniSIG, and SWP will be shared with our stakeholders during bi-monthly SAC and staff meetings.

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

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))

Communication is key to building positive relationships with students, parents, teachers, and other stakeholders. Opportunities for outreach are created through flyers, school newsletters, grade-level newsletters, School Messenger phone messages, the marquee, email, Talking Points, and Class Dojo. Links to information are provided to parents through Class Dojo, Talking Points, and the email version of School Messengers weekly update. Multiple Family Learning Nights will be hosted by the school in order to increase parental involvement in the students' learning processes and therefore increase student achievement. The school's Family Engagement Plan will be available on the "School Information" pull-down menu of the school's website and shared during School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings, and the Title I Annual Meeting. Once the Family Engagement Plan is posted on the school's website and has been shared during school meetings, a Class Dojo message will go out to share the link to the plan with parents.
School Webpage: <https://oakhilles.ocps.net/>

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)

Strengthening the academic program is approached through building teacher capacity, solidifying foundational skills and targeting the Early Warning Indicators. By monitoring attendance and connecting with parents, an increased time will occur for students to work with academic content which will help bolster achievement. Small group instruction time during ELA and math allows for more targeted support during the learning process and assists with decreasing any gaps that students may have. Areas of Focus that are being addressed include: 1) Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems, 2) Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA, and 3) ESSA subgroup specifically relating to Students With Disabilities.

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))

Not Applicable

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No