Oak Grove Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
mission
students
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
resources
areas of focus
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Oak Grove Elementary School

6315 N ARMENIA AVE, Tampa, FL 33604

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

In order to achieve our vision, we will work to nurture a caring environment, motivating staff and students to work as a community always in the pursuit of excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

For all students to excel to their highest potential in their pursuit of excellence.

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
Franchino, Jerry	Principal	Analyze school-wide data both within the content and among grade level teams. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goals in curricular, behavioral and attendance domains.
Coleman, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process at the intervention/ enrichment levels (Tier 2 and Tier 3) and to analyze data to determine student needs.
Connell, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Support the implementation of high quality instructional reading practices at the core and intervention level by collaborating with teachers in planning, delivering and assessing using data driven instruction.
Vanyur, Emily	Other	Ensure the delivery of services to and for Exceptional needs students. Assist in individualized plans to meet the needs of the students.
Wilson, Novenda	Assistant Principal	Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and SIP goals.
Miner, Margarita	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ensure the delivery of services to and for English Language Learner students and assist in instructional planning aimed at meeting the needs of ELL students.
Vetrano, Angela	Reading Coach	Support the implementation of high quality instruction and reading practices at the core level by collaborating with teachers in planning, delivering, modeling, coaching, providing professional development and assessing students in order to utilize data to drive instruction.
Macchio, Francesca	Math Coach	Offer modeling, coaching and professional development opportunities to support the implementation of high quality instructional math practices at the core level by collaborating with teachers in planning, delivering and assessing using data driven instruction.
Cristobal Diaz, Jose	Teacher, K-12	Assisting with SAC and disseminating information to families and helping to analyze schoolwide data.

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.

Teachers and the leadership team analyze schoolwide data at the beginning of the school year and use the data to determine instructional priorities and action steps needed to implement during the school year in order to meet the goals.

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

SIP will be monitored by the leadership team, grade level teams and SAC on a regular basis to include looking at/analyzing data and trends and adjusting the action steps as needed.

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	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: 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	1	50	53	35	37	34	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	8
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	53	49	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	38	0	0	0	0	70
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	3	1	3	22	25	0	0	0	54

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	52	34	36	28	39	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	27	25	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	27	30	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	11	24	0	0	0	46

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	1	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	52	34	36	28	39	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	27	25	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	27	30	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	11	24	0	0	0	46

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	1	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	41	50	53	44	53	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				60			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			32		
Math Achievement*	54	56	59	52	50	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				75			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			20		
Science Achievement*	38	50	54	41	59	59	34		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	59	59	53			43		

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	239
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
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	31	Yes	2	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	46			

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	48			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	53			

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	41			54			38					63
SWD	21			33			21				5	59
ELL	39			52			35				5	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			42							2	
HSP	44			54			38				5	63
MUL												

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	36			59			35				5	65
FRL	41			52			41				5	64

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	44	60	44	52	75	64	41					53
SWD	15	46	38	26	65	62	16					26
ELL	43	62	52	58	76	60	37					53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	58		27	78		15					
HSP	43	58	41	55	71	59	42					51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	62		62	88							65
FRL	43	59	40	52	75	67	38					53

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	42	34	32	43	44	20	34					43
SWD	24	14	8	31	34	20	33					47
ELL	40	32	44	47	52	28	38					43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			23								
HSP	43	34	36	46	46	24	33					42
MUL	36			45								
PAC												
WHT	43	33		39	36		33					43
FRL	41	35	35	41	43	20	33					43

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	43%	53%	-10%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	32%	54%	-22%	58%	-26%
03	2023 - Spring	32%	46%	-14%	50%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	47%	-15%	51%	-19%

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.

Third grade ELA proficiency and science proficiency scores were lower than in previous years. These students were involved in hybrid learning and may have not had the same learning experiences. The science assessment is inclusive of three grade levels of science vocabulary and is challenging for our students learning English.

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

Science proficiency scores were lower than the previous year. The science assessment is inclusive of three grade levels of science vocabulary and is challenging for our students learning English.

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.

ELA proficiency scores are lower than the state average. Our students with disabilities are also showing deficiencies in ELA proficiency.

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

Math proficiency scores continue to show an increase over the past three years. Our school math coach assisted with grade level planning and ELP occurred both during the day and after hours.

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

Attendance and students scoring level 1 on ELA are our largest concerns.

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

ELA proficiency
ELA learning gains
ELA BQ learning gains
Science proficiency
Maintain proficiency in math

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 Collaborative Planning

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.

Historically Florida statewide assessment's show Oak Grove Elementary school students struggle with ELA and Science proficiency. Math has been our school's strength over the last three years. Oak Grove Elementary ELA proficiency is not higher than 50% over the last three years. 40% of Oak Grove Elementary's students are English Language Learners and over 192 students are immigrants to the country. 70% of our student population is Hispanic. Our historic Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) data shows Oak Grove Elementary's English Language Learners component is 55%. The one component of ESSA we did not meet the 41% threshold is Students with Disabilities (SWD). Our SWD proficiency is at 37%, 4% below the 41%.

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

The past three years of state assessment data shows Oak Grove Elementary's ELA proficiency is stagnant around 44%. Past learning gains and bottom quartile gains show Oak Grove Elementary at 60% (learning gains) and 44% (bottom quartile). Our school ELA proficiency score will increase to 55%, ELA gains will increase to 63% and ELA BQ gains will increase to 63% by May 2024. 85% of ELA teachers will implement standard aligned or phonics specific independent task and small group instruction to students by January 2024.

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

Oak Grove Elementary will look at data from PM1 and PM2 as well as other formal/informal (Unit Assessments, DIBELS, iReady Diagnostics) testing to determine student growth and progress. Our core leadership team will conduct monthly walkthrough's collecting data from ELA teacher classrooms and use the data to facilitate conversations on how to improve teacher practice. Specific feedback is given to teachers by administration based on small group instruction and standard aligned independent tasks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Novenda Wilson (novenda.wilson@hcps.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.)

Oak Grove Elementary will use systematic foundational reading instruction (UFLI/SIPPS) to increase the word recognition and comprehension of students. Oak Grove Elementary will use of standard aligned independent task with higher order item types and standard aligned small group instruction will increase student proficiency and learning gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intervention follows the Science of reading which has been shown to increase student reading proficiency. On-grade level instruction, strong instruction, and high expectations is shown to increase student proficiency per the TNTP Opportunity Myth.

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.

Meet with leadership team to discuss goals and data. Set instructional cell goals to reach benchmarks in ELA, Math, and Science. Monitor the progress of the benchmark each month during Leadership Meeting.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: Begin August 2023, on-going monthly throughout the school year.

Weekly PLC and PSLT to monitor student data and continue to plan standard aligned, data driven instruction.

Person Responsible: Novenda Wilson (novenda.wilson@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year.

Monitor subgroup data (SWD and ELL) on quarterly and unit assessments. Problem solve with the leadership team on equitable structure to support students during instruction.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year.

Conduct monthly walkthroughs and collect trend data. Analyze trend data with the leadership and instructional leadership team. Narrow focus of the walkthroughs on highest instructional levers.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly, ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year.

Plan targeted small group instruction with instructional and support staff. Identify target students and plan targeted support.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: January

Monitor subgroup data (SWD and ELL) on quarterly and unit assessments. Problem solve with the leadership team on equitable structure to support students during instruction.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year.

Conduct monthly walkthroughs and collect trend data. Analyze trend data with the leadership and instructional leadership team. Narrow focus of the walkthroughs on highest instructional levers.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly, ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year.

Plan targeted small group instruction with instructional and support staff. Identify target students and plan targeted support.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: January

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

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

Oak Grove Elementary has a trend of students with high absenteeism. Over the last two years, Oak Grove Elementary has below a 90% attendance rate (21-22, 22-23 were both at 89%). As of November 2023, we are at 91.1%. Two highly populated subgroups on our campus are our English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. As of November 23, Oak Grove has 10 ELL and 24 SWD with more than 10 absences.

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

Oak Grove Elementary School will have an attendance rate over 90% for the 23-24 school year. Our school will implement Tier 2 attendance interventions for students showing excessive absences and engage all stakeholders. Each month our attendance percentage is going to be over 90%.
August '23: 92.67%
September '23: 91.29%
October '23: 90.92%

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

Administration and social worker have a data spreadsheet with all students with more than 5 absences. Each week we monitor student absences, inform teachers, and plan conferences to build plans for support. We will analyze student trends and move students toward Tier 2 interventions if needed. During PSLT and quarterly data meetings, student attendance is discussed with each instructional teacher and plans are adjusted on need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.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.)

Schoolwide tier 1 attendance procedures.
Schoolwide structures to discuss attendance data and problem solving.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Involves parents in students learning and impact of student's missing school.

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.

Meet with Social Worker to determine progress monitoring tool and goals. Calendar a bi-weekly huddle with the Social Worker to review attendance data.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: August 2023, ongoing through the 23-24 school year.

Identify students with more than 5 absences. Send teachers notification to reach out the parent to address impact of missing instruction. Document parent and teacher notification on school wide spreadsheet. Focus on students with SWD and ELL students' attendance rate.

Person Responsible: Jerry Franchino (jerry.franchino@hcps.net)

By When: August-September 2023. ongoing throughout the 23-24 year.

Monitor students on attendance plans and shown chronic absenteeism. Students on attendance plans will meet with the Social Worker for counseling.

Person Responsible: Michelle Coleman (michelle.coleman@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year.

Monitor students' attendance rate monthly and inform teachers of student missing more than ten days of instruction. Hold parent conferences with the parents and problem solve around absences. Document the conferences and notifications in our schoolwide spreadsheet.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year.

Inform parents of instructional time by sending lost letters to parents monthly. The instructional time lost letter accumulates time from tardies, sign outs, and absences.

Person Responsible: Michelle Coleman (michelle.coleman@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year.

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

-

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

Teachers will work collaboratively in planning and analyzing data to make instructional choices that benefit the foundational areas of reading.

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

Teachers will work collaboratively in planning and analyzing data to make instructional decisions in the areas of reading.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency will increase to 70%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency will increase to 55%

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.

Engage in classroom walkthroughs to collect data to show evidence of collaborative planning. Analyze walkthrough data to determine a plan for next steps of support.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Franchino, Jerry, jerry.franchino@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We will use collaborative planning with instructional coaches and colleagues to improve standards knowledge and effective ways to integrate content.

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?

These strategies promote professional growth and help implement best practices in instruction through purposful planning of lessons that support our learners in Reading.

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
Create schedule that allows for academic coaches to attend all planning meetings to collaborate, assist and offer feedback and support to teachers while planning instruction.	Coleman, Michelle, michelle.coleman@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

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

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

Oak Grove shares information with stakeholders through the PBIS Rewards app, SAC and faculty meetings, family nights, conference nights and flyers/parent link text messages/calls. This information is also available on our school website at https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/domain/3796

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))

Oak Grove builds positive relationships through family nights and conference nights, canvas, as well as implementing the PBIS rewards app to open communication with parents.

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))

Oak Grove works to strengthen our academic program by providing collaborative planning with coaches, offering immediate feedback on instructional practices, and additional opportunities for extended learning of students (both during the school day and after school hours).

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))

At Oak Grove, all federal programs and funding are being used to target specific areas of need for the school including students in the subgroup that are not meeting the federal index of ESSA.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

> **Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**
>
> -
>
> **Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**
>
> -
>
> **Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**
>
> -
>
> **Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**
>
> -
>
> **Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**
>
> -

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: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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