
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Oakland Avenue Charter

456 E OAKLAND AVE, Oakland, FL 34760

https://oaklandfl.gov/230/oakland-avenue-charter_school

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.

We believe that a connected child is a successful one. We are committed to creating a community that supports and lifts up our students. We are committed to providing a positive, safe and stimulating environment for children to learn, where all are valued. We intend that all children should enjoy their learning, achieve their potential and see value in the community that surrounds them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a school, we are dedicated to providing children with an education that is built on the foundation of community and collaboration. Through cooperation and concerted efforts from parents, families, students, and community, our students will be prepared citizens for the world of tomorrow. OACS offers students a comprehensive education program that focuses on core curriculum and civic engagement that is infused with literacy, arts, sciences, and leading edge technologies.

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
Dwyer, Pamela	Principal	Plans, organizes, administers, manages and coordinates all education programs. Supervises all professional, paraprofessional, clerical, custodial, and other personnel.

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.

Oakland Avenue has a Principal Advisory Council that includes parents, community members, business members and teachers. In addition to this council, we have a very active Parent Teacher Organization. Our School Leadership Team that is made up of teacher-leaders that collaborate with school administration on school programs, activities, and curriculum.

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))

Data will be checked three times per year to ensure on track progress towards desired goals. Changes to approach will be evaluated if we are not seeing a trend upward and/or success markers.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	23%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	4	5	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
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	7	5	10	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	30	28	0	0	0	59
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	

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	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school 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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA 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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	69	57	53	65	56	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				62			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			30		
Math Achievement*	52	60	59	65	46	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				61			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			38		
Science Achievement*	91	63	54	74	61	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	59						

* 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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	289
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	46			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	75			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	68			

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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	1	1
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	75			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	57			

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	69			52			91					
SWD	37			32			54				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	64			29							2	
HSP	75			49			84				4	
MUL	75			38							2	
PAC												
WHT	67			56			94				4	
FRL	66			47			90				4	

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	65	62	41	65	61	38	74					
SWD	21	31	25	34	42	25	33					
ELL												
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	19	27		19	33							
HSP	64	56	50	61	63	17	76					
MUL	78			72								
PAC												
WHT	69	65	30	71	59	53	80					
FRL	60	64	42	55	51		67					

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	68	57	30	58	41	38	70					
SWD	24			31								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			41								
HSP	70	59		59	29		75					
MUL	62			62								
PAC												
WHT	69	49	25	59	43	33	69					
FRL	53	57		52	43		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	67%	54%	13%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	60%	21%	58%	23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	52%	24%	50%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	59%	23%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	62%	-17%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	55%	-17%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	91%	59%	32%	51%	40%

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.

Stagnation in increased growth is found in Math Learning Gains 25% component: 2018-2019 37%; 2020-2021 38%; 2021-2022 38%. This stagnation has filtered into the subgroups (SWD, HSP, WHT) or that component throughout these years. Our SWD subgroup has consistently underperformed in all components during these years. Contributing factors are covid impacts that created learning gaps due to school closure, virtual instruction, covid protocols impacting attendance. .

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

A significant decline is seen from 2018-2019 in ELA 25% Learning Gains for all students. In 2018-2019 57%; 2020-2021 30%; 2021-2022 41% This decline in ELA 25% Learning Gains impacted subgroups SWD, WHT and FRL most significantly. A decline is also found in Math 25% Learning Gains in 2021-2022 for subgroups SWD 25% and HSP 17%

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.

1. OACS unperformed the state results for ELA Proficiency for subgroup SWD: State 28%; OACS 21% (21-22)
2. OACS unperformed the state results for ELA Proficiency for subgroup BLK: State 34.4%; OACS 19%

(21-22)

These two categories are identified as near the federal threshold for identification because of the low demographics in each. Low percentages in each of these groups can be impacted tremendously by even one child. Additionally, Covid impacts effected these two subgroups significantly due to loss of instructional time due to closure, virtual learning, and attendance related to covid protocols.

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

Although a decline from the data seen in 18-19 which was 60% we are seeing an upward trend our 21-22 ELA LG 25%. Our score increased by 11% from 20-21 to 21-22 (30% to 41%)
Our science proficiency scores have continued to climb; 18-19 60%; 20-21 70%; 21-22 74%

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

1. Learning Gains for Lowest 25% in ELA
2. Math Achievement overall

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

1. Increase Math proficiency levels
2. Increase learning gains for Lowest 25% ELA
3. Increase learning gains for Lowest 25% Math overall
4. Increase learning gains Lowest 25% Math subgroup HSP

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Teacher retention from year to year would have a tremendous impact on the efficacy of instructional practices at OACS. We believe that our teacher turn over has impacted our math results due. Building capacity for instructional expertise in the content as well as how to reach students in varying subgroups with varying needs is needed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease attrition rates by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Staff check ins and exit interview reviews

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Dwyer (pamela.dwyer@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.)

Improve teacher working conditions that have been identified as important to teacher retention by developing sense of collective responsibility for student outcomes, a sense of collegiality, trusting working relationships, a sense of safety and discipline in the school, parent-teacher interaction, time for collaboration and planning, and opportunities to be teacher leaders.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Outside of moving away from the area and improving employee benefits, working conditions are identified as one of the biggest reasons teachers leave their school or the field.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

1. Collaborative team planning
2. Team supported data chats
3. High student conduct expectations
4. Dedicated time for team planning with Instructional Coach each month.

Person Responsible: Pamela Dwyer (pamela.dwyer@ocps.net)

By When: June 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

Achievement results in ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gains, Math Achievement, and Math Learning gains for subgroup BLK

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase results in ELA and Math achievement by 15% for subgroup BLK
Increase ELA LG and Math LG achievement results by 10% for subgroup BLK

Monitoring:

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

Determine specific student in need of support within subgroup; utilizing MTSS process to provide interventions, and progress monitor at a minimum of 6 week intervals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Dwyer (pamela.dwyer@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.)

Our focus is to build teacher efficacy in understanding the content of B.E.S.T of both ELA and Math standards. In addition, we will focus on strengthening teacher efficacy in the scaffolding of instructional strategies during small group instruction and student cognitive engagement. 1. We will build and monitor a culture of collaboration through common planning where teachers will work with the Instructional Coach on instructional strategies to provide differentiated small group instruction and intervention groups. 2. Progress Monitoring after each common assessment and diagnostic assessment, as well as walkthroughs and classroom observation with actionable feedback. 3. Teachers will identify the students that are in our ESSA subgroups (Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, English Language Learners) and collaboratively plan based on data-driven decisions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Selecting these strategies aim to provide teachers with effective strategies to make data-driven instructional decisions about student academic achievement.

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.

1. Professional development on BEST standards and curriculum.
2. Progress monitoring on assessments
3. MTSS/interventions for needed skills

Person Responsible: Pamela Dwyer (pamela.dwyer@ocps.net)

By When: June 2024

#3. 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.

Achievement results in ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gains, Math Achievement, and Math Learning gains for subgroup SWD

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will expect to see Students with Disabilities perform at 41% proficiency and Black/African American students on the Progress Monitoring Diagnostic State Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

1. MTSS/interventions for identified and needed skills with fluid groupings for Tier 2 and 3.
2. Collaborative team planning/meetings
3. Monthly Progress Monitoring-

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Dwyer (pamela.dwyer@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.)

Provide teachers with effective strategies to make data-driven instructional decisions about student academic achievement. Effective strategies will be developed through professional development use of high efficacy instructional strategies such as small group based on abilities/needs. The Instructional Coach and teachers will use the data analysis to determine which standards, foundational skills, and spiral standards will be incorporated for differentiated small group instruction, intervention, and learning clinics/ tutoring programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies will target student achievement by providing scaffolded support aligned with individualized academic 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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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)).

We will review of the use of the school's resources supported by all funding sources including both general funds and funds dedicated to school improvement activities.

We will analyze instructional time, early intervention, specialized support personnel usage to ensure that it aligns properly with needed outcomes. Teacher quality and readiness will be evaluated and supported through monthly collaborative planning with Instructional Coach.

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

Kindergarten - 84% scored below level 3 on BOY FAST (2023)

1st Grade - 81% scored below level 3 on BOY FAST (2023)

2nd Grade - 22% scored below level 3 on BOY FAST (2023)

*Intervention to include skill specific Tier II, Tier II and Walk to Intervention per grade level.

* Before, after school and school break learning clinics/tutoring of skill specific needs/gaps.

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

3rd Grade - 77% scored below level 3 on BOY FAST (2023)

4th Grade - 48% scored below level 3 on BOY FAST (2023)

5th Grade - 53% scored below level 3 on BOY FAST (2023)

*Intervention to include skill specific Tier II, Tier II and Walk to Intervention per grade level.

* Before, after school and school break learning clinics/tutoring of skill specific needs/gaps.

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

50% K-2 Grade students performing at proficiency levels on FAST by EOY assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% 3-5 Grade students performing at proficiency levels on FAST by EOY assessment.

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 progress monitoring meetings to review data to include student class performance, teacher observation, and assessment data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dwyer, Pamela, pamela.dwyer@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?

OACS has implemented the use of Orton Gillingham approach in K-5. Orton-Gillingham evidence-based reading instruction includes comprehension instruction. Students connect text using comprehension strategies that include visualization, predicting, main idea, summarizing, and inferencing.

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?

OG uses essential components of reading instruction outlined as evidence-based strategies. The core strategies and practices used are: Explicit Phonemic Awareness Instruction; Systematic Instruction; Reading Fluency Instruction; Vocabulary Instruction; and Comprehension. The program provides systematic, explicit, multisensory, and diagnostic approach to instruction.

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
Assessment Alignment	Dwyer, Pamela, pameladwyer@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.

We utilize an electronic communication system in which we will share and post the SIP for our stakeholders.

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))

Our parent teacher organization, volunteer opportunities, and parent events are that core of our positive relationship building. OACS also utilizes Connected Class Learning Link as partner in providing regularly email communications with our families on standards.

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)

We plan

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))

We plan

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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