

Pinellas County Schools

Southern Oak 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Southern Oak Elementary School

9101 WALSHINGHAM RD, Largo, FL 33773

<http://www.southern-oak.pinellas.k12.fl.us/>

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.

Southern Oak's mission is to educate and prepare each student for college, career and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southern Oak's vision is 100% student success for every child.

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
Moss, Jeffrey	Principal	Ensure safety and effective school operations, instructional leadership, implementation of all aspects of our SIP, hiring/onboarding/evaluation/retention of quality teachers/staff. Ensure each layer of our academic and student support system are implemented. Ensure accountability of our school stakeholders in working toward 100% student success.
Jessie, Brandie	Assistant Principal	Support and amplify the work of the Principal in safety, operations and instructional leadership.
Finn, Courtney	Instructional Coach	Ensure full implementation of our MTSS framework; Lead our extended learning, approaches to intervention, and Title-1 services. Provide direct instruction for targeted students in reading in math for at least 45 minutes of each instructional day.
Hamilton, Krista	School Counselor	Ensure a robust level of supports and interventions around our MTSS behavioral systems framework. Provide direct instruction for students in Social-Emotional Learning. Work alongside our ESE team in helping our students with disabilities to achieve at their best potential.
Taylor, Alma	Attendance/Social Work	Focus on boosting students' attendance rates; provide social emotional supports for students; Lead our Child Study Team (problem-solving approach to student attendance and barriers to success); Provide other related services in support of our SIP progress.

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.

Schoolbased Leadership Team meets weekly to problem-solve around student success, and also monitor elements of our SIP. SBLT meets frequently to discuss current and needed initiatives, plan professional development / focus for faculty/team meetings; School Advisory Committee (SAC) reviews/discusses SIP and provides final approval.

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))

SBLT monitors ongoing student data, plans and implements tiered interventions for students around academic and behavioral needs, and ensures we are making sufficient progress toward each component of our SIP. We monitor individual student data with teacher PLCS and school leadership on a regular basis, using this data to plan content-specific interventions, student groupings, and approaches to help each child achieve learning gains.

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	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: A
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	0	21	21	29	22	16	0	0	0	109	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	1	4	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	7	5	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	22	21	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	17	11	0	0	0	33	
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	1	0	6	11	16	0	0	0	34

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	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	26	36	26	24	24	16	0	0	0	152	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	24	22	0	0	0	71	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	14	14	0	0	0	50	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	2	8	3	2	5	0	0	0	24	

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	1	7	5	0	0	0	13

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	26	36	26	24	24	16	0	0	0	152	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	24	22	0	0	0	71	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	14	14	0	0	0	50	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	2	8	3	2	5	0	0	0	24	

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	1	7	5	0	0	0	13

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	52	54	53	57	55	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				62			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			41		
Math Achievement*	66	61	59	69	51	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				71			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			35		
Science Achievement*	68	62	54	48	62	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	64	59	56			50		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	55			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	64			

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%
FRL	53			

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	48			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	55			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	52			66			68					59
SWD	40			54							3	
ELL	47			53							4	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			44							2	
HSP	50			56			63				5	65
MUL	57			79							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	52			73			70				4	
FRL	41			55			64				5	65

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	57	62	36	69	71	64	48					56
SWD	27	43		59	64							
ELL	45	60		68	80							56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	67		50	61							
HSP	44	48		59	67							56
MUL	67			73								
PAC												
WHT	61	64	35	75	75	72	54					
FRL	48	58	38	61	65	65	43					55

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	49	53	41	65	55	35	60					50
SWD	15	27		33	45							
ELL	15			44								50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52			61								
HSP	26	17		55	42		40					46
MUL	50			61								
PAC												
WHT	55	61	45	70	61	40	65					
FRL	45	53		68	57		64					46

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	58%	57%	1%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	58%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	63%	62%	1%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	66%	6%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	61%	7%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	60%	5%	51%	14%

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.

It is evident that our students' ELA achievement is our lowest data component. While many of our students demonstrated noticeable growth from fall to spring STAR (K-2) and FAST (3-5) progress monitoring, we need to provide an instructional framework that helps all students increase their reading fluency, vocabulary, and writing skills to achieve their greatest potential in ELA. Factors that must continue to be addressed are the focus and rigor of our K-2 literacy instruction, a schoolwide focus on improving phonemic awareness to aid decoding/fluency, and helping all students build their working vocabularies and thinking skills around the BEST ELA standards.

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

Our students' overall ELA achievement declined -1% (57 to 56), whereas our goal was to increase students' ELA achievement to >60%. Analyzing our students' data throughout the year indicated that a few students who had demonstrated proficiency the prior year and/or during fall or winter progress monitoring did not ultimately achieve proficiency in the spring. We believe that reading stamina and a focus on essential thinking skills required for BEST standards-aligned ELA assessments are crucial factors for ensuring student success. Improving students' reading fluency (decoding automaticity, working vocabulary) will contribute greatly to improvement in this area.

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.

Our students performed ahead of the state/district averages in Math and Science achievement level. This leaves ELA achievement as our greatest gap when compared to state/district averages. As noted above, reading fluency, vocabulary, critical thinking skills, and effective writing skills will all contribute to our students' overall ELA growth.

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

Our 5th grade students achieved overall +21% higher Science (SSA) proficiency than the previous years' cohort (i.e., 47% increased to 68%). Our teachers and instructional leaders maintained a keen focus on students' science standards vocabulary and conceptual knowledge, provided ample opportunities for spiraling reviews of science standards/vocabulary, and interjected weekly lessons with content-based gaming that kept students' interests and helped motivate them to sharpen their skills. We also closely monitored students' progress across the various science benchmark assessments and "mock SSA" to fine-tune concepts and vocabulary in which students needed the most improvement to achieve their best.

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

Student attendance continues to be an area of concern for a portion of our students. It was evident in 2022-2023 that some students were not able to achieve at their greatest potential due to excessive absences (full days missed, extreme tardies, etc.).

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

- #1: Improve students' reading fluency and standards-aligned thinking skills to ensure greater ELA success.
- #2: Improve students' math standards-aligned problem-solving skills to ensure high levels of learning gains.
- #3: Continue the approaches in science instruction that helped our students improve their proficiency.
- #4: Ensure consistency across our school in our instructional environments, with all teachers accountable for communicating on "learning boards" our students' daily learning targets, progress toward mastery, and exemplars of meeting the various success criteria across ELA, Math and Science Standards.
- #5: Improve our overall implementation of PBIS to be more consistent across classrooms and common areas of our school. Focus on teaching and reinforcing students' positive behaviors and maintaining a safe & respectful learning environment for all students.

Area of Focus

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

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

56% of our students in grades 3-5 demonstrated proficiency in ELA, meaning 44% of our students did not demonstrate ELA proficiency. In third grade, less than half (49%) of our students demonstrated proficiency in ELA. Much of this proficiency gap comes students needing to improve reading fluency, vocabulary knowledge, and standards-based reading comprehension skills. We must continue to build our teachers' core instructional practice and interventions that will help all students improve their phonemic awareness, working vocabulary, and overall reading comprehension and writing abilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will help all students improve their reading fluency, vocabulary knowledge, and writing skills so that our students' overall ELA proficiency increases from 56% to 65% as measured on FAST (3-5) and STAR (VPK-2) assessments. Our goal for our third-grade cohort is 70% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers, Administrators and MTSS Coach will closely monitor students' ELA data throughout the year, primarily during PLC team meetings and focused student-data chats. Students will become part of this process as they stay aware of their relative data, set goals, and celebrate their growth across the school year. Students' ELA achievement and learning gains will be monitored throughout the year with various assessments and data, including:

^FAST/Star Progress Monitoring (September, December, May)

^IStation/ISIP assessments (monthly, August to May)

^ELFAC/Core Phonics assessments (1:1 monitoring, ongoing throughout the year)

^Reading Running Record Levels (1:1 monitoring, ongoing throughout the year)

^Written Responses: Rubric-scored / Exemplars

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.)

We will ensure that our whole group and small group ELA instruction in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles, including systematic approaches to:

^Improve students' phonemic awareness;

^Grow students' working vocabulary knowledge;

^Helping all students elevate their reading fluency and writing abilities to proficiency ;

^Ensuring students with disabilities (SWD) and students who are English language learners (ELL) receive specially designed instruction and interventions that help them to accelerate their reading fluency levels, as well as their working vocabulary and language usage abilities, to elevate toward ELA proficiency.

We will also will strategically focus on our K-3 teacher's ELA instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback from teacher-leaders, coaches, and administrators.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instructional practices is critical for teaching novices (i.e., elementary students) in learning new content, skills, or concepts. Effective instruction requires: 1) full, clear explanations; 2) teacher modeling; 3) providing a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation; 3) full guidance during student practice; and 4) timely, teacher corrective feedback.

Moreover, to develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabetic), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

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.

Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate grade-level text (while applying foundational skills) with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August to October 2023

Recruit strong ELA Champions at each grade level so that school leaders and teachers will attend ELA Champion meetings 3 x a year and partner to collaborate and focus on strengthening practices to support implementation of B.E.S.T. Standards and ELA curriculum aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 through March 2024

Ensure teachers integrate phonological awareness, phonics, word study and spelling, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension strategies into an explicit, systematic and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to May 2024

Ensure all teachers install and maintain "Learning Boards" that include daily BEST standards-aligned ELA learning targets; a place to post student data progress (ex: FAST, ISIP, Running Records); and, examples of mastery, and exemplars (ex: writing samples, responses to exit tickets, etc.).

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August to October 2023

Third grade teachers, MTSS Coach, administrators and hourly teachers will support our third-grade students by engaging in intervention groups based on students' individual needs.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to May 2024

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

70% of our students in grades 3-5 demonstrated proficiency in Math, meaning 30% of our students did not demonstrate Math proficiency. We will increase our students' overall math abilities by continuing to deepen our knowledge of Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will help all students improve their math number sense, computation, and thinking & reasoning skills to ensure our students' overall Math proficiency increases from 70% to 75% as measured on FAST (3-5) and STAR (K-2) assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers, Administrators and MTSS Coach will closely monitor students' Math data throughout the year, primarily during PLC team meetings and focused student-data chats. Students will become part of this process as they stay aware of their relative data, set goals, and celebrate their growth in math across standards. Students' Math achievement and learning gains will be monitored throughout the year with various assessments and data, including:

^FAST/Star Progress Monitoring (September, December, May)

^Dreambox lesson completion and accuracy rates (ongoing, August to May)

^Unit benchmark assessments <McGraw Hill> through Performance Matters (ongoing, August to May)

^Standards-aligned exit tickets/formative assessments, monitored for accuracy & posted on classroom "Learning Boards" as evidence of mastery

^Math running records to measure computational fluency (especially multiplication; grade 4)

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.)

We will deepen our understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will support students as they work towards daily standards-aligned learning goals in math. Shifting from simply stating a standard to communicating learning expectations ensures that goals are appropriate, challenging, and attainable. When goals are specific, revisited throughout the lesson and connect to other mathematics, they become clearer to students. Effective teaching of mathematics establishes clear goals for the mathematics students are learning, situates goals within learning progressions, and uses the goals to inform instructional decisions. Effective Mathematics Teaching Practices (Principles to Actions, NCTM 2014)

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.

Teachers, MTSS and administrators engage in Just-in-Time Content PD to learn what students are expected to master, including the vertical progression of standards, the horizontal alignment of standards, Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR's) and stages of fluency.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to April 2024

Teachers, MTSS and administrators implement and facilitate a goal setting environment where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitor academic progress throughout the year, revise goals based on data, and celebrate success.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to April 2024

Ensure all teachers install and maintain "Learning Boards" that include daily BEST standards-aligned Math learning targets; a place to post student data progress (ex: FAST, Dreambox, Unit Tests); and, examples of mastery, and exemplars (ex: writing samples, responses to exit tickets, etc.).

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to October 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

While there was a +21% jump in Science proficiency from our 2021-22 (47%) to 2022-23 (68%) cohorts of 5th grade students, we still must improve instructional practices to sustain this growth in our students' proficiency. Our area of focus for improving Science instruction in 2023-24 will be to utilize standards-aligned curricular materials to create a common foundation of rigorous expectations for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will continue to improve our students' knowledge of grades 3-5 science standards to increase our Science proficiency level from 68% to 72% as measured by the 5th grade SSA (Science Standards Assessment) in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers, Administrators and MTSS Coach will closely monitor students' Science data throughout the year, primarily during PLC team meetings and focused student-data chats. Students will become part of this process as they stay aware of their relative data, set goals, and celebrate their growth in science across standards. Students' mastery of science standards and related vocabulary will monitored through:

^Unit Benchmark Assessments for 4th and 5th grade

^Mid-Year Formative Check in January

^Mock SSA in April

^Standards-aligned exit tickets/text-dependent formative assessments, monitored for accuracy & posted on classroom "Learning Boards" as evidence of mastery (ongoing)

^"Gamified" science vocabulary and conceptual review activities (ongoing)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

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.)

We will focus on teacher clarity throughout Science instruction through the use of relevant district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher Clarity as an evidence-based intervention focuses on teaching that is organized and intentional. Teacher clarity ensures that student learning is based on clear, transparent expectations. Students will be provided expectations at the start of each science lesson through standards-aligned learning goals. Students will work through a hands-on or text-dependent lesson and then evaluate their learning through an exit ticket or other type of formative assessment.

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.

During collaborative planning, teachers will ensure students in grades 1-5 have a deep understanding of the science curriculum, correlation to unit and state assessments, materials management, and pacing/scheduling.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to May 2024

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to May 2024

Implement goal setting opportunities where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data, and celebrating successes.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to May 2024

Ensure all teachers install and maintain "Learning Boards" that include daily science standards-aligned learning targets; a place to post student data progress (ex: benchmark/unit assessments); and, examples of mastery, and exemplars (ex: responses to text-dependent exit tickets, etc.).

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 to October 2024

#4. 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.

We will improve our positive culture and environment for learning through systematic implementation of our PBIS systems at Southern Oak Elementary.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will achieve 100% of staff and students aware of and able to describe the components of our PBIS as measure by focused walkthroughs and surveys, by March 2024.

Monitoring:

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

We will provide direct instruction to students and refresher professional development for staff on the components and implementation of our PBIS. Our Site-Based Leadership/PBIS team will also monitor student discipline data trends and the ongoing implementation of our PBIS from intermittent school walkthroughs to look for evidence of implementation (posters, expected procedures in action, "Hoot Loot Store" being utilized with "Hoor Loot" students earn through PBIS.

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.)

Our school will improve our practices in order to provide an environment that is supportive of students' academic and positive behavior development through a systematic approach to PBIS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When school stakeholders clearly define expectations, preferred outcomes, and a continuum of intervention and supports to help all student reach their best potential, then collaborative learning and meaningful relationships can persist throughout our school community.

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.

Provide a refresher/professional development for teachers and staff in which we clearly define our PBIS systems, outcomes, and preferred reinforcements for positive student behaviors.

Person Responsible: Brandie Jessie (jessieb@pcsb.org)

By When: August - September 2023

Provide direct instruction for all students about our PBIS expectations, procedures, and opportunities for reinforcement, focusing on how "Safe, Kind, Respectful & Responsible" looks and sounds in each area of our school.

Person Responsible: Krista Hamilton (hamiltonkr@pcsb.org)

By When: August to October 2023

#5. 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.

The achievement of Black/African American scholars at Southern Oak was 35% scoring at or above Level 3 on the ELA FAST assessment administered in May of 2023. Those same scholars scored 42% Level 3 or above on the Math FAST assessment also given in May of 2023. Black/African American students scored below the school average in both Reading and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is for our African American scholars to score at or above the school goals of 65% proficient in ELA and 75% proficient in Mathematics.

Monitoring:

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

During each assessment period (August, December and May) we will analyze the achievement of our African American students to be sure that they are progressing at or above the rate of the other students in the school. Data chats will be scheduled with teachers during PLC meetings to monitor the progress of all subgroups, Black/African American students included.

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.)

Teachers will implement Learning Boards in classrooms to ensure focused, precise teaching of all standards. Students will track their own data to determine where they are performing as compared to the expectation. As students work toward mastery, teachers will post evidence of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Learning Boards are an example of an instructional best practice. They allow the students to see the daily learning target as well as the expectation of mastery.

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.

Ensure through close monitoring of all classrooms that each student is provided with clear expectations of daily learning goals, exemplars of success, and opportunities to produce daily evidence of mastery toward standards-aligned learning targets.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: October 16, 2023

Ensure all students who are Black/African-American/Multi-racial are taught how to set personal learning goals, and have teachers engage students in tracking their progress toward mastery through various data, classroom evidences displays, and 1:1 data chats with teachers/staff.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: November 2023

Ensure students in this targeted sub group area each paired with a trusted staff member who will check-in on students ongoing progress, and also help provide social-emotional supports as needed.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023

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).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

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

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Strategically focus on 3-5 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

We will put in place professional practices that will help raise our at least 60% of our K-2 students to reading proficiency by May 2024, as measured by FAST Progress Monitoring #3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will put in place professional practices that will help raise our at least 65% of our 3-5 students to reading proficiency by May 2024, as measured by FAST Progress Monitoring #3.

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.

Teachers, coaches, and administrators will have regularly occurring data chats to review a variety of student achievement and growth data in reading fluency, comprehension and writing.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Moss, Jeffrey, mossj@pcsb.org

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?

- o Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
- o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
- o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o Ensure 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?

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Professional Learning:</p> <p>? Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction.</p> <p>? School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment.</p> <p>? School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.</p>	Moss, Jeffrey, mossj@pcsb.org
<p>o Literacy Leadership</p> <p>? School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading.</p> <p>? Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches and district staff who can support training in the use of evidence-based curriculum, instruction, and intervention aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.</p> <p>? School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection</p>	Moss, Jeffrey, mossj@pcsb.org
<p>o Assessment</p> <p>? Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs</p> <p>? Determine a structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments is in place to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading.</p>	Moss, Jeffrey, mossj@pcsb.org

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.

Parents will receive information about Title I and how the program benefits all Southern Oak students at our Title-1 Annual Meeting (September 2023), through weekly phone calls/emails from the principal, and via communication and open house events with teachers. Moreover, our School Advisory Council (SAC) will have openly announced monthly meetings at which time our SIP goals and progress will be reviewed and discussed for feedback from family and community members (ongoing, August 2023 to May 2024).

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))

We will foster open and 2-way communication with families, starting with our meet the teacher and school open house events, and continuing with parent-teacher conferences, weekly direct communication from the principal, and various parent/family engagement events (ex: Literacy Night, STEM/Earth Day festival, other fun family events hosted at the school, etc.).

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)

Our Site-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) maintains a shared document that tracks each student in PSW & tiered supports; this includes data monitoring, interventions, progress monitoring and "next steps." Our school counselor, psychologist and MTSS coach pay particular attention to these data and have disseminated an updated SBLT "student nomination" form that teachers utilize to bring highly specific student concerns to the attention of our problem-solving team (SBLT). For Tier 1 & Tier 2, we have closely monitored growth and net-change in percentile for all K-2 students in STAR Reading and Math; and scale score changes for cambium reading and math in grades 3-5. Our PLCs have also been working in more depth to learn about and unpack the BEST ELA standards, facilitated at times by district ISDs (ex: using "the gold document" to drive differentiation in reading lessons in grades 3-5; Flamingo routines to drive word work for grades K-2).

We will continue to provide targeted instructional coaching and embedded Professional Development and collaboration that helps teachers expand their knowledge and confidence to implement differentiated reading intervention groups. We will also continue to help teachers grow their knowledge of language embedded in the Florida B.E.S.T. standards.

We will ensure our new Family Community Liaison attends district training opportunities and expands our opportunities for stakeholder involvement in our school. We will build upon current practices for communication in order to solicit even more feedback from families (stakeholder survey, and re: participation in family events and new initiatives).

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))

Our Literacy Leadership Team has focused specifically on building stronger family engagement around supporting students' reading growth. We have also shared our family stakeholder survey with all staff and our SAC, and facilitated collaborative conversations around how we can best respond to this important feedback from our Southern Oak Families. We have also tried to increase our pathways of communication to families through social media, weekly electronic communication/ school messenger calls, and plans to enhance our school website with more up-to-date communications and information for families.

We held several family engagement events in 2022-2023 that were geared towards student academics, with specific focuses on reading and science. These events included a Literacy Night and our annual STEM/"Green Festival" where community partners joined us to help support the growth of our students'

real-world connections and academic achievements. We are able to monitor the effectiveness of these events through survey responses from our families as well as attendance at these events.