

Brevard Public Schools

Oak Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	30
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	33

Oak Park Elementary School

3395 DAIRY RD, Titusville, FL 32796

<http://www.oakpark.brevard.k12.fl.us>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

Everybody, every day, whatever it takes.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Oak Park Eagles will accept challenges to become brave and confident leaders.

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
McDonough, Adrea	Principal	
Wehrly, Katherine	Assistant Principal	
Mayo, Tonja	Teacher, K-12	
Leach, Chelsea	Reading Coach	
Pennerman, Gregory	Other	

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.

Oak Park administration conducted a week long Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA), which included the following stakeholders: Oak Park leadership team, teachers, families, community partners, Oak Park volunteers and business partners.

Overall data was examined by stakeholders: STAR/FAST grades PK-6, i-Ready, ESSA Subgroup data, retention, discipline, and attendance data.

The stakeholders used a Protocol to examine each data area.

PROTOCOL: Stakeholders worked in teams to examine data and answer the Protocol questions.

Information was gathered and utilized for the SY23-24 SIP plan.

- Areas of Improvement
- Areas of Need of Improvement
- Action Steps to keep in the SY22-23 School Improvement Plan
- Action steps to tweak or discard
- Action steps to add
- Stakeholders provided actionable input for the SY 23-24 School Improvement Plan

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))

Monitoring Effective Implementation & Impact:

The administrative leadership team and academic leaders will do the following actions to examine the School Improvements' Impact on achievement:

- Weekly scheduled walkthroughs of ELA, Math, Science and Intervention blocks with feedback
- Data from the walkthroughs will be used to Tier Teachers for Need and Support. Administration and coaches will decide on which teachers will be added to the coaches' Case Load for the two week period
- Bi-Weekly Friday meetings with administrative leadership and coaches to review the following areas for impact:

- o Case Load: Which teachers will be added and taken off the case load of the coaches
- o Shared google Documents for Admin. Team and Coaches: Case load, notes, and Schedule
- o Coaches will provide an update on what action steps were taken for teachers on their case load and evidence of impact. Examples but not limited to: Student Task Sampling, Writing Samples, Science Lab Analysis, Math Work Samples

MONITORING OF IMPACT/DATA ANALYSIS

- Bi-weekly Data Meetings to analyze the following data:

- o PM1, PM2, and PM3 STAR/FAST Data
- o i-Ready Diagnostic Data
- o ESSA subgroup data for STAR/FAST & i-Ready Data
- o District Assessment Data for ELA, Math, and Science
- o Intervention Data Review
- o Lexia minutes/lessons
- o i-Ready minutes/passed lessons for both Reading and Math
- o PENDA Mastery for grades 3-6

TEACHER RETENTION DATA

- Quarterly review of retention data

REVISING of PLAN for IMPACT:

- Quarterly Leadership Team Meetings to Discuss Needed Revisions
- Director Meetings

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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI

Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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 *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	18	18	24	13	9	14	21	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	3	14	18	22	16	23	21	0	0	117
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	4	0	16	2	2	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	15	24	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	15	35	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	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	4	19	13	26	10	28	25	0	0	125

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	1	6	2	16	4	3	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	7

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	14	16	13	19	10	17	23	0	0	112	
One or more suspensions	0	8	6	10	5	16	9	0	0	54	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	4	19	10	0	0	37	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	14	13	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	32	23	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	17	39	33	0	0	97	
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		

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	2	7	1	11	15	35	38	0	0	109

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	2	9	2	2	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	8

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	14	16	13	19	10	17	23	0	0	112	
One or more suspensions	0	8	6	10	5	16	9	0	0	54	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	4	19	10	0	0	37	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	14	13	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	32	23	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	17	39	33	0	0	97	
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		

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	2	7	1	11	15	35	38	0	0	109

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	2	9	2	2	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	8

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	58	53	37	61	56	38		
ELA Learning Gains				46			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			39		
Math Achievement*	33	58	59	33	49	50	38		
Math Learning Gains				52			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			19		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	29	58	54	38	60	59	25		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	38	54	59	38					

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	178
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96
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	20	Yes	4	4
ELL	25	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	17	Yes	4	4
HSP	43			
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	37	Yes	2	

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	28	Yes	3	3
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	3	3
HSP	42			
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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			33			29					38
SWD	21			21			10				4	
ELL	18			18							3	38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			17			13				4	
HSP	45			41							3	42
MUL	42			28							2	
PAC												
WHT	45			39			42				4	
FRL	40			32			32				5	40

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	37	46	33	33	52	45	38					38
SWD	21	33	18	24	40	29	32					
ELL	27	36		27	64							38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	41	37	15	38	20	29					
HSP	41	35		41	61							30
MUL	40	47		23	53							
PAC												
WHT	42	49	38	42	56	73	43					
FRL	34	43	27	26	47	43	37					42

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	38	45	39	38	30	19	25					
SWD	18	38	30	23	29	21	23					
ELL	24			24								

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	43	33	17	22	17	19					
HSP	28	38		30	21							
MUL	40	55		35	20							
PAC												
WHT	48	46	50	51	38		33					
FRL	31	38	30	34	25	22	15					

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	33%	59%	-26%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	61%	-26%	58%	-23%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	61%	-7%	47%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	56%	-25%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	67%	-16%	54%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	60%	-29%	59%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	28%	61%	-33%	61%	-33%
05	2023 - Spring	20%	55%	-35%	55%	-35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	27%	57%	-30%	51%	-24%

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.

The lowest data component for Oak Park was Science proficiency at 31% for the 22-23 school year. Math proficiency was the second lowest data component for the 22-23 school year, with 33% proficiency. ELA proficiency for SY 22-23 was 40%.

All three data components show trends of Oak Park scoring below state and district average.

ELA Proficiency:

SY23- 40%

SY22- 37%

SY21- 38%

Math Proficiency:

SY23- 33%

SY22- 33%

SY21- 38%

Specifically, Math's lowest component was 4th grade's proficiency, at 28%.

ELA's lowest component was 3rd grade's proficiency, at 31%.

Subgroup Data:

SY23 SY22 SY21

SWD (57 students): 10 28 18

ELL (10 students): 0 38 24

BLK (53 students): 32 25 21

FRL (167 students): 37 34 31

Additionally, Grade 5 Science proficiency was 38% in the 21-22 SY, and 31% for the 22-23 SY. This decline of 7% proficiency points shows a significant dip in student achievement on grade 5 science standards.

All data components show a three year trend of below the district and state proficiency averages.

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

The greatest decline, when looking at overall student proficiency, is grade 5 science. SY22 was 38% proficient and SY23 was 31%.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The overall proficiency gap when compared to the state average

4th Grade has the greatest gap between the school average and the state average. Oak Park had a 36% proficiency level and the state average was 58%. (22% difference)

5th Grade had the second highest gap between the school and state average. Oak Park's average proficiency level was 34% and the state's average was 54%. (20% difference)

Factors:

BPS Proficiency for Grade 6 for ELA- 61%

Oak Park Proficiency for Grade 6 ELA- 54%

State Proficiency for Grade 6 ELA- 47%

BPS Proficiency for Grade 6 for Math- 67%

Oak Park Proficiency for Grade 6 Math- 51%

State Proficiency for Grade 6 Math- 54%

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

Overall, ELA proficiency increased from 37% to 40%.

Some actions taken to increase ELA proficiency were grade-level weekly planning, in a structured setting with the literacy coach. Teachers frequently reviewed data, including iReady, Lexia, and FAST.

Sixth grade increased significantly in ELA on FAST from PM1 31% proficiency to 54% on PM3.

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

Oak Park's overall area of concern illustrates that a number of our students have one or more Early Warning Signals. The data below shows the correlation between the Early Warning Systems and its effect on Level 1 proficiency in ELA and Math.

Review of the EWS data illustrated a correlation between absent 10% or more days, Level 1's on statewide ELA and Math, and one or more suspensions in grades three through six.

Data Analysis by Grade Level

Third Grade

- Absent 10% or More Days: 13
- Level 1 ELA: 25 students
- Level 1 Math: 27 students
- One or More Suspensions: 19

Students illustrating more than One Early Warning Signal (EWS): 26 students

Fourth Grade

- Absent 10% or More Days 9
- Level 1 ELA: 15 students
- Level 1 Math: 15 students
- One or More Suspensions: 16

Students illustrating more than One Early Warning Signal (EWS): 10 students

Fifth Grade

- Absent 10% or More Days 14

- Level 1 ELA: students 24
 - Level 1 Math: 35 students
 - One or More Suspensions: 6
- Students illustrating more than One Early Warning Signal (EWS): 28 students

Sixth Grade

- Absent 10% or More Days 21
 - Level 1 ELA: 21 students
 - Level 1 Math:
 - One or More Suspensions:
- Students illustrating more than One Early Warning Signal (EWS): 25 students

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

- ELA Proficiency (SY 23- 40%)
- Math Proficiency (SY 23- 33%)
- Science Proficiency (SY23- 31%)
- Subgroup Proficiency in SWD- 10%, ELL- 0% (out of ten students), FRL- 37% and Black- 32%

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Teacher Retention: SY 22-23 was 72% At the end of SY 21-22 (13 teachers left out of 46 teachers).

SY 22-23, Teacher Retention soared to 95% with only two teachers leaving Oak Park.

There were several action steps put in place during the SY 22-23 that supported the increase in Teacher Retention. These action steps will be implemented again during SY23-24.

Teacher retention is a crucial component of a school's culture and environment. The increase in Teacher Retention during SY22-23, allowed for the Literacy Coach, Title I Contact, and Teacher on Assignment (TOA) to stay out of the classroom and to perform their much needed roles. The Literacy Coach was able to provide teachers with a weekly, structured planning in ELA. Administration and the Literacy Coach were able to conduct weekly walk throughs to inspect what was learned at the structured planning. The coach and the leadership team were able to provide needed professional development in bite size sessions twice a month. The TOA was able to conduct monthly Kid Talk meetings with teachers to put students of need on behavior tier II plans, which supported school-wide discipline. The Title I Contact was able to do a weekly co-teach model with fifth grade science teachers and perform hands-on science labs. The Title I Teacher was also able to plan and hold Title I data nights and academic nights for families and students. These nights were well attended and brought a sense of school community to Oak Park. Because discipline was stabilized school-wide, there was an Increase in Substitute Teachers from SY21-22 allowed teachers during SY22-23 to work in their positions and take time off without hesitation, which also improved culture and environment. Finally, retaining teachers allows the team to focus on areas of improvement in lieu of on-boarding.

Measurable Outcome:

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

95% instructional staff;

95% support staff

Monitoring:

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

Action Steps to Monitor Desired Outcomes

- The secretary will provide a monthly report on Instructional and Support Attendance
- Eagle Supports (One teacher leader to support each grade level) will be a liaison between teachers/ Support and Administration. Supporters relay areas of concern with possible solutions to administration.
- Two additional surveys will be administered to Oak Park staff by the Consulting Team "Educators Thriving" in October and February, historically both high behavior months for Oak Park. These surveys will be utilized to see areas of strain on staff and allow administration to support.
- A Culture School Improvement Plan was designed for the SY 23-24 by School Leadership Team
- Insight Survey Data

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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

NA

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.

Action Steps:

- July 2022 Bootcamp for New Teachers to Oak Park allowed teachers to get familiar with curriculum, on-line software for students, Brevard Discipline Policies, Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS), and school culture. (SY 23 Bootcamp occurred in July for the new teachers and new teachers to grade levels.
- Bite size PDs were offered to teachers (at least two per month)
- Monthly Mentorship meetings
- Structured Planning in ELA supported teachers
- Substitute Teacher goodie bags
- A Sub Survey was developed during SY 22-23, to give a voice to substitutes and provide needed information to the classroom teacher.
- The secretary provided subs with "Active Shooter" and Safety Information

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Teacher and Staff Retention Data will be analyzed quarterly. Staff attendance, an indicator of retention, will be monitored bi-weekly at OPE's data meetings.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 makeup of Oak Park's overall enrollment consists of the following percentages of subgroups:

SWD- Approximately 27% of students enrolled
 ELL- Approximately 5% of students enrolled
 FRL- 100% of students enrolled
 Black- Approximately 24% of students enrolled

Subgroup data as an Area of Focus is a crucial need for Oak Park because there is a three year trend that four of our subgroups (SWD, ELL, FRL and Black) have performed below the Federal Index of 41% or higher proficiency.

SY23 SY22 SY21

SWD (57 students) 10 28 18

ELL (10 students) 0 38 24

BLK (53 students) 32 29 21

FRL (167 students) 37 37 31

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD for SY24- 41% proficiency
 ELL for SY24- 41% proficiency
 BLK for SY24- 43% proficiency
 FRL for SY24- 45% proficiency

Monitoring:

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

At PM1 and PM2, we will analyze specific subgroup data by cohort, and note which students are making growth towards end of year proficiency. Individual students will be monitored to determine how many additional points would be needed to be considered proficient. i-Ready data will also be monitored at D1 and D2 as an additional source of information on student achievement and gaps.

Subgroup data on District Assessments will also be analyzed at bi-weekly data meetings with teachers, administration and Literacy Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.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.)

In order to increase proficiency in these underperforming subgroups, the following evidence-based interventions will be put into place:

- Scaffolded Supports
- Explicit Instruction
- 95% Group
- Lexia
- Structured Planning in Reading and Math

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The programs and practices listed above address the identified need to improve our underperforming subgroup data. The identified practices and programs show proven record of effective for the target population as they are:

- B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
- Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
- Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based
- Systematic and/or explicit

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.

Oak Park offered a July Jump Start to School for subgroup students in grades K, 2nd and 3rd grade. This five-day program offered students the opportunity to reacclimate themselves to the school setting. Teachers reviewed end of year benchmarks in Reading and Math to negate summer slide.

Person Responsible: Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

By When: • Bi-weekly data meetings • Review after FAST ELA & Math PM1 & PM2 • Review after i-ready ELA & Math D1 & D2

Action Steps

- Weekly structured planning in the area of reading, focused on strategies to reach students in underperforming subgroups
- Instructional Assistant specifically supporting ELL students in ELA and Math
- Instructional Assistant specifically supporting SWD students in ELA and Math
- Weekly Data Meetings to monitor students progress on various formative and summative assessments
- Monitoring to ensure the benchmark-aligned curriculum will be used in our SWD classrooms
- Teachers will track and monitor ESSA subgroup data for ongoing progress of i-Ready diagnostics, state-monitoring tool, and benchmark assessments

Person Responsible: Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

By When: • Bi-weekly data meetings • Review after FAST ELA & Math PM1 & PM2 • Review after i-ready ELA & Math D1 & D2

Hire a highly-effective teacher to monitor subgroup data in the areas of Reading, Math, and Science.

- Monitor intervention data for underperforming subgroup students
- Ensure IPST compliance for a Subgroup student underperforming in tier 1 and/or tier 2
- Attend structured planning and provide additional strategies and resources for teachers to implement in their classrooms with subgroup students
- Model high-yield classroom strategies

- Pull subgroup students in grades 3-6 in a small group not illustrating improvement for additional intervention in reading and math

Person Responsible: Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

By When: • Bi-weekly data meetings • Review after FAST ELA & Math PM1 & PM2 • Review after i-ready ELA & Math D1 & D2

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

ELA- For the past three years, the percentage of our students meeting proficiency on state required assessments has been below the district and state averages.

2022-2023 FAST ELA Proficiency- 40% (Below state average of 56%)

2023 FAST ELA data:

3rd grade- 33% 3+

4th grade- 35% 3+

5th grade- 33% 3+

6th grade- 54% 3+ Above state average (47%), but below district average (61%)

Math- For the past three years, the percentage of our students scoring 3+ on the Math Florida Assessment has been below the district and state averages. SY 22-23 (33% 3+)

3rd grade- 31% 3+

4th grade- 28% 3+

5th grade- 20% 3+

6th grade- 51% 3+

Science for the past three years has been below district averages.

Oak Park science proficiency SY22-23 (31%)

SY22-23- District 57%; State 51%

In 21-22, science proficiency at Oak Park was 38%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

FAST data proficiency goals by grade for the 2023-2024 school year is based on student cohort EOY data taken during PM3 in May 2023.

P1 P2 P3

Grade ELA Math ELA Math ELA Math

Third 40% 50% 45% 60% 50% 67%

Fourth 30% 30% 40% 40% 50% 50%

Fifth 30% 30% 40% 40% 50% 40%

Sixth 35% 35% 45% 45% 55% 55%

Science

2021 2022 2023 2024

25 38 31 50

Monitoring:

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

- Weekly structured planning with Unit/End Task in Mind (ELA) & bi-weekly for Math and Science
- Weekly learning walks will inspect what was expected from structured planning
- Administration will tier teachers for need

- Administration will establish Case Load for Coaches (Teachers that will receive a coaching cycle)
 - Coaching Cycle will be employed
 - o Observation of block
 - o Feedback
 - o Strategies, plan for improvement is established
 - o Professional Development is provided
 - o Observe model classroom, if applicable to the situation
 - o Teacher demonstrates learned strategies/plan
 - o Coach continues to coach through observation and feedback
 - o Impact is observed through tasks/work samples and observation notes
 - o Gradual release of teacher
 - Monitor Intervention blocks
 - Bi-weekly Data Meetings to monitor progress
- Monitor i-Ready, Lexia, and PENDA data monitored at bi-weekly data meetings
- Monitor i-Ready, Lexia and PENDA data at bi-weekly data meetings
- Science: Hands-on lab scheduled weekly with Interactive note-booking

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.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.)

- Benchmark-aligned district curriculum implementation for Reading, Math and Science
- Magnetic Readers in K-5
- Small group instruction- Targeted, data-driven, and structured
- Explicit instruction
- Systematic instruction
- Scaffolded Instruction
- Weekly Structured Planning in Reading/bi-weekly structured planning for Math and Science
- 95% Group Reading Intervention
- Lexia Reading
- i-Ready Reading and Math
- PENDA Science

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All evidence-based practices/programs listed above address the identified need that is improving PK-6 literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effective for the target population as they are:

- BEST and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards for Science aligned
- Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
- Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based
- Systematic and/or explicit
- Science- Implement District Assessments- Use formative data to drive instructional decisions and small group remediation

Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality, aligned materials. Collaborative planning, with learning walks, specific feedback, professional development & modeling where needed, and data analysis, can improve results for learners.

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.

ELA Action Steps

- Benchmark-aligned structured planning sessions with Literacy coach
- Student data-driven conferences/notebooking
- Student-led conferences as data nights
- Bi-weekly data meetings will be held by Literacy Coach, Administration, and Teachers to monitor student progress
- Compliance Teacher will work with teachers to track and monitor ESSA subgroup data for ongoing progress monitoring
- Administration will continue with ESE "least restrictive schedule"
- Administration and Coach will develop and implement a "Good to Great" Tool to utilize during learning walks
- Academic Support Program (K to 6) will be utilized for lowest 35% on i-Ready and State Monitoring Tool (beginning in August for ESSA subgroups)

Person Responsible: Chelsea Leach (leach.chelsea@brevardschools.org)

By When: • Bi-weekly data meetings • Review after FAST ELA PM1 • Review after FAST ELA PM2 • Review after i-ready ELA D1 • Review after i-ready ELA D2

Math Action Steps

- Benchmark-aligned structured planning sessions with math coach and Title 1 interventionist (T1)
- Administration and District Math Coach will create and utilize the "Good to Great" tool for learning walks
- Implementing benchmark-aligned curriculum with fidelity
- Grade level meetings focused on benchmark clarification and tiered training
- Track/monitor unit assessments
- Math intervention implemented and tracked with fidelity
- Math model classrooms
- Teachers will provide small group instruction daily based on data
- Academic support tutoring provided to students before and/or after school
- Academic Support Program (K to 6) will be utilized for lowest 35% on i-Ready and State Monitoring Tool (beginning in August for ESSA subgroups)

Person Responsible: Katherine Wehrly (wehrly.katherine@brevardschools.org)

By When: • Bi-weekly data meetings • Review after FAST Math PM1 • Review after FAST Math PM2 • Review after i-ready Math D1 • Review after i-ready Math D2

Science Action Steps

- Standards-aligned planning with Title I Teacher and interventionist (T1)
- Administration, Eagle Supporters, and Teachers will track and monitor PENDA Mastery data and PENDA assessment data

- BrevardZoo School One Week Program (T1)
- Teachers will have students track PENDA data on PENDA Journals
- Title I teacher and interventionist will work with teachers to improve instruction by collaborative planning, modeling and practicing in a co-teach model with grades 3-6 (T1)
- Stem Camps for specific 3-6 students on Wednesdays and Fridays will support hands-on “Nature of Science” (Emphasizing invites to ESSA subgroup students)
- Spiraling 3rd and 4th grade standards for 5th graders
- Fifth graders will be invited to five Super Science Saturdays (T1)
- Academic Support Program for Science grade 5, determined by district assessments (T1)

Person Responsible: Katherine Wehrly (wehrly.katherine@brevardschools.org)

By When: • Bi-weekly data meetings o PENDA review of lessons mastered • Review after district assigned assessments

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).

Specifically, to monitor our UniSIG Supplemental Grant, Oak Park will:

- Weekly budget meetings with bookkeeper and leadership team to ensure designated funds are being used appropriately, as written and allocated in each area of focus in the supplemental grant
- Academic Support Program for ESSA subgroup students will be monitored at the beginning of August and progress monitored throughout August and September for the supplemental grant
- Teachers will receive names of students in ESSA subgroups and will keep a list of resources that were funded by the supplemental grant before distributing to students
- Professional Development scheduled and budgeted for pre-planning
- Substitutes for teacher PD will be provided and scheduled
- Lexia on-line resource will be monitored bi-weekly at data meeting. Lexia minutes and lessons will be reviewed.

Progress will be monitored for Subgroup students.

- Grant-funded teacher's schedule will be monitored to ensure support of ESSA subgroup students; meeting agendas and meeting minutes will be reviewed by administration at leadership team meetings

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

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

- D2 i-Ready data from 22-23 shows that 52% of students in grades 1-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the state wide ELA assessment.
- 22-23 FAST Data shows 67% of 1st Graders, 52% of 2nd Graders scored below grade level.
- Planning sessions need to have a clear structure of focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and transfer to instruction.

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

22-23 FAST Data shows 69% of 3rd Graders, 65% of 4th Graders and 67% of 5th Graders scored below grade level. (Levels 1 and 2)

- Increasing Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in 3-5
- Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, and assessments, and transfer to instruction

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

i-Ready Reading D2 22-23 and Monthly Goals for 23-24

D2-Feb D1-Oct D2-Feb

Grade ELA ELA ELA

K- 71% 50% 70%

1- 47% 40% 65%

2- 49% 40% 65%

F.A.S.T. PM 1 data indicated the following proficiency by grade level. Goals for PM 2 and 3 follow the baseline data.

P1 P2 P3

Grade ELA ELA ELA

K- 40% 60% 70%

1- 35% 40% 50%

2- 35% 40% 50%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

i-Ready Reading D2 22-23 and Monthly Goals for 23-24

D2-Feb D1-Oct D2-Feb

Grade ELA ELA ELA

3- 44% 30% 50%

4- 33% 30% 50%

5- 27% 35% 50%

6- 34% 30% 50%

F.A.S.T. PM 1 data indicated the following proficiency by grade level. Goals for PM 2 and 3 follow the Baseline data.

P1 P2 P3

Grade ELA ELA ELA

3- 40% 45% 50%

4- 30% 40% 50%

5- 30% 40% 50%

6- 35% 45% 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.

- PM1, PM2 FAST
- I-Ready D1 and D2
- Learning walks with feedback
- Benchmark Advance Assessments
- Intervention Data
- Intervention instruction to specifically target identified gaps

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers will implement the Benchmark Universe curriculum and sixth grade teachers will implement the Savvas curriculum, both align with the B.E.S.T. Standards. Teachers will also utilize Lexia, iReady, Read Naturally, and 95% Group materials during the intervention process. These materials are systematic and explicit as well as meet Florida's definition of evidence-based materials. Finally, grades K-2 will utilize iReady Magnetic Reading Curriculum Associates materials twenty to thirty minutes daily to enhance foundational skills. Grades 3-5 will utilize iReady Magnetic Curriculum to support gaps in instruction. All teachers will also be given standards-aligned Collaborative Planning time, Site-based Coach Support, Ongoing PD utilizing Teach like a Champion (these PDs equip teachers with various strategies to increase Academic instruction in ELA), Instructional Expectations, and research-based quality curriculum resources. Pacing and guidance documents for core instruction will be referred to with fidelity to support K-12 implementation.

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?

All evidence-based practices/programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effective for the target population as they are:

- B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
- Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
- Meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based
- Systematic and/or explicit
- Geared towards struggling readers with an emphases on Foundational skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define roles/responsibilities • Develop content area Planning Protocols-Good to Great Tool • Communicate the expectations for planning with coaches and teachers • Establish Principal-Coach partnership agreement • Collaborate with content coaches before/after each planning. <p>Literacy Coaching:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaching Cycles • Calendared Collaborative Planning • Focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning. • Identify and plan for the supports that teachers will need before, during, and after planning (pre-planning sessions, coaching questions to connect teacher thinking to aligned instruction, etc.) <p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI • Identify Tier 2 and Tier 3 Students • Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, and intervention OPM <p>Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide PD/coaching • Train on Instruction/Intervention Materials • Identify mentor teachers and establish model classrooms 	<p>Leach, Chelsea, leach.chelsea@brevardschools.org</p>

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.

Title I Resources and Supports

Title I funding supports 2.5 teachers & 2 IAs T1

- Title I Contact/Interventionist
- o One IA pulls groups of students during the Reading and Math Intervention Block
- o One IA supports the Lexia Lab on the activity wheel K-6
- Oak Park's Literacy Coach
- Smore News
- Parent Involvement Resources for parent check-out

The School Improvement Plan will be disseminated in the following ways:

- Annual Meeting/Open House Night
- Parent Newsletters/SMORE T1
- School Advisory Council (SAC)
- Parent Teacher Organization (PTO)
- Student Data Nights (2 scheduled/1 per semester)
- Parent Conference Nights (2 scheduled/1 per semester)
- Title 1 Literacy Night
- Facebook Page
- Teacher Newsletter T1
- Principal YouTube Video
- FOCUS Outreach
- Parent SIP Brochure

Agendas, meeting minutes,& sign-in sheets will be used for compliance.

Oak Park received \$ 90,720.00 to support our ESSA subgroups, specifically the subgroups SWD, ELL, BLK, and FRL. These subgroups have underperformed for three consecutive years. (Data below) A second funding of \$75,000.00 will be given to support Oak Park's ESSA sub groups.

Subgroup Data:

SY23 SY22 SY21

SWD (57 students): 10 28 18

ELL (10 students): 0 38 24

BLK (53 students): 32 25 21

FRL (167 students): 37 34 31

Supplemental Grant for ESSA Subgroups: \$90,720.00

Academic support is be offered in August and September to grades first through sixth to shore up areas of need in reading and math for students in the above subgroups. Students receive academic support in the area of Reading and Math. Kindergarten students will be added to classes in September.

Reading is being offered for one additional hour on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays before or after school to subgroup students underperforming. Math is offered to subgroup students one additional hour on Tuesdays and Thursdays before or after school to students underperforming in math or reading. Resources purchased with funds will be resourced to these students to support at home support.

Administration held a five-day Comprehensive Needs Assessment to plan for the improvement and to set goals for the subgroups. (Below) Also, the leadership attended a Transformational Leadership Institute by Principal Kafele to learn strategies to improve achievement in our African American subgroup. The team will be leading a montly PLC with teachers. The book written by Principal Kafele, The Teacher 50 will provide teachers with proven supports to employ in classrooms.

UniSig Funding: (\$75,000.00)

Oak Park Administration has hired a highly-effective teacher to monitor the students in the four subgroups. The teacher will attend bi-weekly data meetings to ensure students progress is being analyzed and monitored. The teacher will work with teachers to make sure IPST forms are completed and intervention is being done with fidelity. In addition, the teacher will pull students not making adequate progress in small groups with evidence based strategies to support.

EOY Goals:

SWD for SY24- 41% proficiency

ELL for SY24- 41% proficiency

BLK for SY24- 43% proficiency

FRL for SY24- 45% proficiency

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))

There are several reasons why the parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school, effectiveness of school's information being sent on-line and information being sent from the school.

To begin, Oak Park staff engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction. Teachers communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are readers."). Teachers meet in PLCs bi-weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups.

This data, in addition to discipline referrals or discipline reports, in and out-of-school suspension and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, provide frequent feedback to students, encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:

- Structured planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- Student work is displayed throughout school
- Students are recognized for positive behavior and classrooms can receive compliment cards when staff catch the class exhibiting S.O.A.R. expectations. (T1)

Another reason for the improvement on the Insight Survey is that administration has a clear code of conduct for students and adults. The code of conduct has been derived with input from students, families, community partners, volunteers, business partners, and school personnel. We have established specific strategies that are intended to support in reducing disproportionate discipline. Implement evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g. positive behavioral supports, social emotional support) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches.

SAC/PTO - The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. The re-establishment of a Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) is in the beginning stages. These organizations reach out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours and

offer translation). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students. We recognize the importance of families being involved in a variety of ways in school. Our intent with building a strong PTO is to provide families with flexible opportunities to be involved.

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))

The Oak Park Leadership Team has created several ways to strengthen Oak Park's academic program in the school. The following strategies will increase student achievement this school year:

- July Jump Start to School for new kindergarteners to Oak Park
- July Jump Start for primary grades to work on expectations, routines and procedures and review material to strengthen students' first months of school
- Structured, weekly planning in ELA, conducted by the Literacy Coach
- Weekly walk throughs with feedback
- Model Classrooms for teachers to visit when needed
- Academic Support Program for subgroup students underperforming on SY 22-23 FAST PM3 in the months of August and September to shore up areas of concerns
- After school homework club will happen when there is a late bus
- Scheduled Lexia Lab on the activity wheel for students in grades K-6 T1

Oak Park is working on ways to enrich students. Administration offered a Benchmark Advanced training during pre-planning from a Benchmark trainer. The focus was moving students to small groups in order to provide differentiated instruction, with a focus on enrichment. A focus on readers' theater was learned by participants. This will be utilized during the reading block when possible. Another way to strengthen Oak Park's enrichment program is to offer five days of Science Saturdays for grade five students. The focus will be hands-on science and vocabulary. Finally, Oak Park offers a unique opportunity to students in grades three through sixth. We created a S.O.A.R. Camp opportunity for activity last year and will offer it again this school year. We plan to offer the following camps one day a week for activity: Band, Basketball/Track, Art, and STEM. Students will pick their top two camps. Students will be able to change camps in the second semester. The semester will culminate with a basketball night and Track Night (second semester). The art camp will make banners. The band will play music. The STEM camp will make giveaways to sell to fans with the 3 D printer (T1).

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))

Oak Park participates in the Friday Food bags for specific students.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
---	--------	---	---------------

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups					\$71,250.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	5100	333	0051 - Oak Park Elementary School	UniSIG		\$71,250.00	
			Notes: Hiring a highly qualified teacher to support MTSS and support raising proficiency for the following subgroups: SWD, ELL, Free and Reduced, and African American. This teacher will work specifically with students in small groups in Reading, Math and Fifth Grade Science.				
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction					\$0.00
Total:						\$71,250.00	

Budget Approval

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

Yes