

Brevard Public Schools

Oak Park Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oak Park Elementary School

3395 DAIRY RD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

Demographics

Principal: Adrea Mcdonough L

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2020

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
School Grades History	<p>2018-19: C (44%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (43%)</p> <p>2016-17: C (51%)</p> <p>2015-16: C (45%)</p>
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Everybody, every day, whatever it takes. (2021)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Oak Park eagles are future leaders willing to accept challenges to become brave and confident individuals S.O.A.R.ing to the top. (2021)

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McDonough, Adrea	Principal	The Principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. The position is responsible for the total operational management of the school.
Walker, Holly	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is charged with curriculum, curriculum development, induction and administrative duties as assigned by the Principal.
Mayo, Tonja	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Mayo provides social emotional support to students. She also chairs the School Advisory Council. She provides academic interventions to students to support achievement.
Pennerman, Gregory	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Pennerman participates in a co-teach model with the fifth grade team weekly during the fifth grade science block. He is charged with planning with the third through fifth grade teams in order to implement best practices to improve science achievement. He also monitors the fidelity of the PENDA program and district science assessments for grades three through fifth grade, to enhance student achievement in science. He also provides ELA and Math interventions with intermediate students to close the gap in instruction.
Wittholt, Lysette	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Wittholt provides Response to Intervention to students in the primary grades, to enhance student achievement. She participates in the problem solving process with the school-based team and teachers as needed.
Hilton, Alexander	Other	Title 1 Contact Mr. Hilton provides Response to Intervention to students in the primary grades, to enhance student achievement. He participates in the problem solving process with the school-based team and teachers as needed. He coordinates events and works to build family partnerships in order to enhance student achievement.
Diaz, Juan	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Diaz provides Response to Intervention to students in the intermediate grades, to enhance student achievement. He participates in the problem solving process with the school-based team and teachers as needed.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Leach, Chelsea	Reading Coach	Mrs. Leach is charged with professional development, data monitoring, intervention with fidelity, and collaborative planning with grade levels.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 1/4/2020, Adrea Mcdonough L

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

559

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

19

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	85	65	66	77	91	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	8	27	17	18	22	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	6	2	2	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	3	23	35	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	3	30	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	5	26	34	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	14	4	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	74	63	69	86	86	81	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Attendance below 90 percent	5	9	10	6	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	1	12	4	13	9	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	2	1	6	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	74	63	69	86	86	81	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Attendance below 90 percent	5	9	10	6	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	1	12	4	13	9	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	2	1	6	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%			42%	62%	57%	44%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	45%			48%	60%	58%	40%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%			44%	57%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	38%			46%	63%	63%	44%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	30%			53%	65%	62%	52%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%			41%	53%	51%	32%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	25%			31%	57%	53%	45%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	60%	-33%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
06	2021					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	60%	-28%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2021					
	2019	52%	67%	-15%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	29%	56%	-27%	53%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady

Summative Tests for Science - Look at 4th grade science data for current 5th graders if available.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/(10%)	39/(45%)	45/(52%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/(15%)	39/(65%)	36/(60%)
	Students With Disabilities	0/(0%)	6/(33%)	6/(33%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/(25%)	24/(35%)	39/(53%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/(25%)	24/(35%)	39/(53%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/(10%)	4/(33%)	6/(50%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/(11%)	10/(15%)	22/(33%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/(12%)	9/(18%)	19/(39%)
	Students With Disabilities	2/(13%)	2/(13%)	3/(19%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/(7%)	12/(23%)	23/(42%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/(7%)	12/(23%)	23/(42%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/(7%)	1/(7%)	3/(21%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22/(32%)	18/(26%)	24/(35%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/(27%)	13/(25%)	17/(33%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/(10%)	1/(10%)	1/(10%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/(15%)	11/(20%)	23/(36%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/(15%)	11/(20%)	23/(36%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/(10%)	0/(0%)	0/(0%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10/(13%)	31/(39%)	43/(54%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/(10%)	22/(37%)	31/(50%)
	Students With Disabilities	0/(0%)	2/(10%)	4/(20%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/(3%)	15/(21%)	25/(35%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/(3%)	15/(21%)	25/(35%)
	Students With Disabilities	0/(0%)	2/(15%)	3/(16%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/(18%)	24/(27%)	37/(41%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/(16%)	24/(36%)	37/(55%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/(4%)	2/(7%)	4/(15%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9/(13%)	20/(28%)	36/(46%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/(13%)	20/(28%)	36/(46%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/(5%)	2/(11%)	7/(37%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15/(22%)	17/(26%)	22/(65%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/(15%)	11/(21%)	15/(28%)
	Students With Disabilities	2/(9%)	2/(10%)	2/(10%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/(13%)	15/(24%)	20/(31%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/(13%)	15/(24%)	20/(31%)
	Students With Disabilities	2/(10%)	2/(10%)	2/(10%)
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	18	38	30	23	29	21	23				
ELL	24			24							
BLK	21	43	33	17	22	17	19				
HSP	28	38		30	21						
MUL	40	55		35	20						
WHT	48	46	50	51	38		33				
FRL	31	38	30	34	25	22	15				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	31	29	23	48	41	20				
ELL	20	36			70						
BLK	25	46	40	23	38	33	13				
HSP	43	47		49	65						
MUL	50	55		43	60						
WHT	47	49	43	54	54	42	40				
FRL	39	46	46	47	52	41	30				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	32	35	25	31	18	17				
BLK	26	32	30	30	42	21	16				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
HSP	34	34		39	51	40	23				
MUL	58	52		44	50						
WHT	49	43	49	49	55	38	55				
FRL	38	35	42	39	46	30	38				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	234
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	24
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25

Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	29
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

SY 20-21 data shows students are significantly below district averages in 3+ proficiency in ELA [38%], Math [38%] and Science [25%].

*Student achievement in ELA- For the past three years, the percentage of our students scoring 3 or above on ELA Florida Standards Assessment has been below the district and state averages.

SY21-22 (22% 3+) iReady Diagnostic 1 data, when compared to last year's diagnostic D3 (41% 3+), also shows students have fallen further behind in ELA.

Grade level 2021 FSA ELA data is as follows:

3rd grade - 36% proficient on FSA ELA

4th grade - 24%

5th grade - 32%

**Strengths include ELA learning gains, which were 45% in SY 20-21.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The two lowest performing cells are Math Lowest 25th percentile performing at 19% 3+ proficiency and science achievement at 25% 3+ proficiency. Additionally, i-Ready data SY 2021 shows SWD/ African American subgroups continue to be under performing. (update FSA data when populates) ELA and Math proficiency 3+ continues to be below district averages ELA (38%) (57%) Math (38%) (54%).

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors to lower performing student achievement include lack of consistency of instruction due to teacher and student chronic absenteeism (30% of all students), lack of math interventions and lack of purposely planned collaborative planning time between classroom and ESE teachers to support explicit instruction for SWD students. New actions to address the need for improvement will be the use of high quality materials, evidence-based professional development, intentional planning between ESE and classroom teachers and the implementation of data informed instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains was our highest performing cell (45%) but we are still (6% points under the district average) this will continue to be an area of focus.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Intentional interventions and the use of an effective MTSS problem solving process made an impact on student progress.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

- Extended day
- ASP
- Quality of Implementation of New ELA Curriculum
- Intervention
- Penda with Fidelity
- Data Chats
- Small Group Instruction

- Monitoring L35%
- Mentors- Peer support and goal setting in addition to SEL.
- MTSS weekly data talks with a data wall. Incorporate into GLM.
- Teacher Tool Box
- Incentivizing iReady lessons passes
- Data driven, direct small group interventions

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The following professional development opportunities will be provided to the Oak Park teachers:

- Zearn Model of Instruction
- BEST Standards training and implementation
- New ELA Curriculum implementation
- Penda with Fidelity
- i-Ready toolbox and Eureka training
- Data analysis training and ways to data can be used to inform instruction

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

- Administration and Eagle Supporters will monitor ZEARN Model implementation (5 ZEARN lessons/ per week) and provide feedback on ways to improve instruction.
- Grade levels will meet weekly to intentionally, collaboratively plan and provide individualized grade level embedded professional development when and where needed
- Weekly MTSS meetings to monitor attendance needs with an intervention team consisting of social worker and parent liaison to implement wrap around services when needed.
- Teachers are implementing "Teach Like a Champion" training learned this year. Leadership and Instructional Coaches are building schoolwide coaching and feedback systems via implementation of strategies from "Get Better Faste"r (2020, Santoyo).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Oak Park is focusing on standards aligned instruction in ELA(see also additional strategies and action steps under specific ELA Area of Focus), Math and Science.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

- Student achievement in ELA- For the past three years, the percentage of our students scoring 3 or above on ELA Florida Standards Assessment has been below the district and state averages. SY 21-22 (21% 3+) i-Ready Diagnostic 1 data, when compared to last year's diagnostic D3 (41% 3+), also shows students have fallen further behind in ELA. Grade level 2021 FSA ELA data is as follows:
3rd grade - 36% proficient on FSA ELA
4th grade - 24% proficient on FSA ELA
5th grade - 32% proficient on FSA ELA
- Student achievement in Math- For the past three years, the percentage of our students scoring 3 or above on ELA Florida Standards Assessment has been below the district and state averages. SY 21-22 (Still Testing) i-Ready Diagnostic 1 data, when compared to last year's diagnostic D3 (46%), also shows students have fallen further behind in ELA.
- Student achievement data in Science for the past three years has been below district averages. SY 20-21 (25%) SY 18-19 (31%) SY 18-19 (45%)

Measureable Outcome:

- Math Achievement: Current: 38% Goal: 42%
- Math Learning Gains: Current: 30% Goal: 40%
- Math Lowest 25%: Current: 19% Goal: 40%
- Science Achievement: Current: 25% Goal: 40%

Monitoring:

- Quarterly Teacher and student data chats based on i-Ready Progress Monitoring
- Classroom walk-throughs with feedback to monitor implementation of high-quality instruction and intervention

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Through collaborative planning and district support, teachers/leadership will focus on the following high yield strategies for increasing student achievement from John Hattie's work:
- Teacher Clarity- 0.75 effect size
 - Teacher Estimates of Achievement- 1.44 ES
 - Comprehensive instructional programs for teachers- 0.72 ES
 - Phonics Instruction- 0.60 ES
 - Writing Program- 0.46 ES
 - Scaffolding- 0.58 ES
 - ZEARN Model of Instruction
 - Penda with Fidelity

- District Science Assessments-Monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Based on a comprehensive review of data, including Insight Survey feedback and classroom walk-through data, Tier 1 core instruction and learning tasks in ELA, Math and Science are not consistently aligned with new state standards. The learning gains made by our Lowest 25% continue to be an area of improvement for ELA and Math. This may indicate a lack of progress in Tier 2 and 3 interventions, while at the same time pointing to an issue in Tier 1 school-wide. Collaborative planning for Tier 1 ELA, Math and Science instruction provides an opportunity to assure both instruction and learning tasks are appropriately aligned.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA

- Teachers will build knowledge of BEST Standards and implement aligned lessons after training by State Literacy Coach.
- Literacy Coach will train teachers through weekly professional developments with State Literacy Coach on topics such as. small group instruction, vocabulary, writing.
- Teachers will deliver high quality instructions after weekly collaborative planning sessions with Literacy Coach, which includes practicing the lessons, reading the text and ensuring high level questioning and writing tasks.
- Teachers will use Write Score progress monitoring to determine students' writing gaps and plan intentional writing lessons.
- Teachers will close achievement gaps by using a walk to intervention model with fidelity, 5 days a week and through Academic Support Programs.
- Teachers will progress monitor interventions every three weeks and alter instruction accordingly .
- Administration will build an ESE "least restrictive schedule" and ESE teachers use exit tickets to accelerate and remediate instruction.

Person

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

MATH

- Teachers will implement the Eureka/Zearn Model through support by Title I Math Interventionist.
- Teachers will ask students to conduct five ZEARN lessons per week in grades K-5. Grade 6 will require five lessons in i-Ready to be completed each week.
- Teachers will deliver math intervention 5 days a week after determining students learning gaps. "Do the Math", i-Ready lessons and path and review of exit tickets will be used to intervene.
- Teachers will use i-Ready Math progress monitoring to determine students' gaps and to plan intentional re-teach math lessons.
- Teachers will use the i-Ready prerequisite report and student instructional groupings to support groupings.
- Administration will build an ESE "least restrictive schedule" and ESE teachers will use Eureka curriculum to accelerate and remediate instruction.
- Leadership will conduct classroom walkthroughs with feedback to monitor math instruction. The walk-through tool will assess pacing, engagement and have an an area for tier 1/intervention noticings. The tool will be used to improve instruction.

Person

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

SCIENCE

- Teachers will implement 5E model of science instruction after support by District content specialist.
- Teachers will intentionally collaboratively plan with the Title I Science Interventionist lessons. The lessons will be co-taught in order to fill gaps of instruction.

- Teachers will use district science assessments to determine gaps in background knowledge and scaffold.
- Teachers will implement Penda science support with fidelity.
- Administration and Eagle Supporters will monitor District Assessments and Penda fidelity.
- Leadership will conduct classroom walkthroughs in support of improving science instruction and provide feedback to teachers on improved practices.
- Title I teacher will improve instruction by collaborative planning, modeling and practicing in a co-teach model.

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

Data Driven Instruction Across Content Areas

- Data room will be used by all to monitor and make systemic decisions related to instruction/intervention.
- Students will monitor their learning and set goals using data notebooks.
- Teachers will utilize the Data Sheet, which includes progress monitoring, intervention, attendance, behavior to give the complete picture of the whole child in order to formulate next steps.
- Eagle Supporters, which are Title I teachers and Interventionist, will be assigned to a specific grade level to monitor student data (i-Ready, Penda, Attendance, ZEARN) and support teachers through giving feedback on implementation on new initiatives.

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SY20-21 data shows attendance and discipline data illustrates 63 students (34%) have had one or more out of school suspension referrals. 30% of students at Oak Park are chronically absent (missing more than 10% of school days). SY20-21 Discipline data indicates 31 students who have multiple suspensions due to chronic behavior and SEL concerns.

Measureable Outcome: Attendance: Current 30% of all students chronically absent Goal: 15%
 Discipline: Currently (12% (63 students) received one or more out of school suspensions) Goal: 6% (31 students)

Monitoring:

- Administration will have a weekly meeting to discuss attendance areas of concerns with teachers.
- Eagle supporters will monitor attendance by grade levels on a bi-weekly basis.
- The Teacher on Assignment will monitor RTI data on a bi-weekly basis.
- The Assistant Principal of Behavior will work with teachers on the MTSS system for behavioral.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide timely, relevant professional development on Trauma Informed Classrooms, PBIS, Zones of Regulation, and Teach like a Champion that will provide teachers with a well-stocked toolbox for managing minor and major incidents.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Having well-managed classrooms and teachers that support social emotional learning are conducive to lowering behavioral incidents.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Partnerships with parents: Teachers will conduct positive phone calls, SMORE newsletter bi-weekly to improve family communication.

Person Responsible Holly Walker (walker.holly@brevardschools.org)

2. Attendance incentives:

- Classroom level awards for attendance given out.
- Marquee used to announce attendance goals achieved.
- SMORE (school newsletter) will announce grade level attendance awards. (T)
- White board in car loop use to announce weekly attendance rates.
- Staff will call families of chronically absent students to check and connect.
- Attendance data will be monitored in data room in addition to academics.

Person Responsible Holly Walker (walker.holly@brevardschools.org)

3. Social worker will collaborate with Parent Liaison to provide wrap around services to families/students with chronic absenteeism/discipline concerns.

Person Responsible Holly Walker (walker.holly@brevardschools.org)

4. MTSS meetings including leadership and teachers to problem solve root causes of discipline and attendance concerns, track impact of solutions, and plan additional support. Additionally, teachers will be guided to document and implement intervention data in order to make sure strategies are impacting achievement/attendance/engagement.

Person Responsible Holly Walker (walker.holly@brevardschools.org)

5. PBIS increased implementation

- Check in - Check out System: Students with 3 or more referrals are assigned a staff member to daily check in with a specific behavior plan. Students earn PBIS points as an incentive for following the plan.
- Clear discipline process: Leadership will implement a 7-step discipline process, where teachers implement multiple proactive interventions prior to writing a referral. Teachers will be trained during pre-planning. A checklist of the 7-step system will lead to fidelity of implementation via increased specific to teachers.
- Schoolwide Expectations: Teacher leaders created schoolwide expectations for hallway, cafeteria, arrival, dismissal etc. All students attended and practiced expectations with activity & classroom teachers at the beginning of the year in a "bootcamp" style training. PBIS incentives are awarded to students, classrooms and grade levels for demonstrating expectations. (T)
- PBIS school store for students to visit.
- PBIS monthly fun days (The fun days will cost PBIS points to join.)

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

6. Social Emotional Learning Time in Each Classroom

During the first 1/2 hour of every day will be dedicated to teaching students how to regulate their feelings. All teachers received Zones of Regulation book and participate in a PLC to implement, practice and reflect on student progress in improving their ability to self-monitor their behavior. (T)

Person Responsible Tonja Mayo (mayo.tonja@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student achievement in ELA- For the past three years, the percentage of our students scoring 3 or above on ELA Florida Standards Assessment has been below the district and state averages. SY21-22 (22% 3+) i-Ready Diagnostic 1 data, when compared to last year's diagnostic D3 (41% 3+), also shows students have fallen further behind in ELA. Grade level 2021 FSA ELA data is as follows:
 3rd grade - 36% proficient on FSA ELA
 4th grade - 24% proficient on FSA ELA
 5th grade - 32% proficient on FSA ELA
 Another concern is the students with disabilities (SWD) and black subgroups. Students with Disabilities Subgroup (SWD) 25% proficiency
 Black Student Subgroup 25% proficiency

- *ELA Achievement: Current 38% Goal: 50%
- *ELA Learning Gains: Current 45% Goal: 50%
- *ELA Lowest 25%: Current 39% Goal: 50%

Measureable Outcome:

Grade level 2022 FSA ELA data goals are as follows:
 3rd grade - 36% proficient on FSA ELA Target: 42%
 4th grade - 24% Target: 42%
 5th grade - 32% Target: 42%

Monitoring:

- Quarterly Teacher and student data chats based on i-Ready Progress Monitoring
- Classroom walk-throughs to monitor and provide feedback on implementation of high quality instruction and intervention
- Collaborative planning during weekly meetings
- Benchmark Summative Assessments
- Savvas Summative Assessments
- Written Response (DBQ) for intermediate grades 4-6

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

Tier 1 (Core) Curriculum is on the 2021 approved Florida Instructional Materials Adoption list.
 Florida Benchmark Advance 2022 (K-5) ©2022, Florida Edition
 myPerspectives Florida English Language Arts Grade 6, ©2022, 1st Edition

Evidence-based Strategy:

ESSA
 i-Ready: This approach helps educators accelerate growth and grade-level learning. These tools provide rigorous and motivating reading and mathematics instruction that:
 *Personalize pathways to growth with precise instruction that is guided by i-Ready Assessment data, * Motivate students to persist in building their skills and
 *Provide scaffolded support that meets the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-

Tier 1 (Core) 21 % of students are 3+ in ELA (3rd grade - 36%, 4th grade - 24% and 5th grade - 32%)
 based on 2021 ELA Achievement data. Implementation of high quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic

awareness, fluency and comprehension. High-quality reading instruction requires teachers understand more than simply what to teach. Collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers to understand how to identify students' instructional needs, select appropriate materials, organize instruction to maximize learning, and differentiate instruction.

based

Strategy:

ESSA Subgroups & Tiered Intervention

iReady: Students arrive at varying ability levels. Driven by the i-Ready Diagnostic, lessons in Reading provide tailored instruction meeting students where they are and encourages them as they develop new skills. Tools for Instruction provide actionable, in-the-moment resources for addressing gaps in small group and one-on-one settings.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA [Note these action steps are in addition to action steps in Area of Focus 1: Standards aligned instruction and are in support of RAISE requirements.]

- Teachers will use Write Score progress monitoring to determine students' writing gaps and to plan intentional writing lessons.
- Teachers will teach students to use the writing process for a variety of purposes. (Strong Evidence)
- Teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. (Strong Evidence)
- Teachers will teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies. (Strong Evidence)
- Teachers will teach students to identify and use the text's organizational structure to comprehend, learn, and remember content. (Strong Evidence)

Person

Responsible

Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

Action steps continued from above:

- * Teachers will provide explicit vocabulary instruction. (Strong Evidence)
- Teachers will close student achievement gaps by using a walk-to-intervention model with fidelity, 5 days a week and through the Academic Support Program. (Strong Evidence)
- Administration will monitor and provide feedback to teachers through the use of a walk-through tool.
- Literacy will attend professional development and weekly meetings with the Regional Literacy Director.

Person

Responsible

Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

SY19-20 (lagging data) in the SafeSchools for Alex data base shows Oak Park with violent incidents at 2.03 per 100 students. The root cause of many major behavior referrals is related trauma and social emotional risk factors. In SY21-22, teachers and staff are dedicated to implementing PBIS initiatives described in the 2nd Area of Focus mentioned above. These strategies include: social worker support, guidance intervention, positive incentives, clear schoolwide expectations, teacher training and implementation support, and zones of regulation training for families/teachers.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2020-2021 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty "insight surveys" and a student survey called "youth truth". These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment. The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school, effectiveness of school's information being sent online and information being sent from the school. Areas of improvement included: Increase in parent/teacher communication, and more resources relating to classroom assistance. Focus areas for improvement planning include ensuring that FOCUS & classroom resources are available for all parents with relevant information. Parent academic resources will be sent with the school's newsletter to provide extra resources for parents to help their children with academic development.

Student data from our "Youth Truth" survey indicate that we were below the average for Brevard Public Schools in the following categories: Academic engagement, academic rigor and relationships. These focus areas will be addressed with the reinforcement of standards aligned instruction, developing positive relationships with students and raising the level of rigor in daily instruction. Monthly PLC meetings will include specific action analysis of these standards and ensure that items are being addressed. Additionally, students will have daily morning meetings to support SEL and improve staff/student relationships. Our faculty insight survey also included areas of strength that included leadership, hiring process and diversity, equity, and inclusion. Target areas for improvement include learning environment and academic opportunity. Using this trend data, resources will be provided in each faculty newsletter and during our PLC meetings focusing on strategies found in "Teach Like a Champion".

Additionally, we will implement research based SEL curriculum to provide targeted instruction to help ease the impact of emotional hardships from things such as COVID19, family trauma and community trauma. Examples include Harmony SEL materials with content to be delivered by our classroom teachers.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The school 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 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:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- Student work is displayed throughout school
- Students are recognized for positive behavior

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively makes themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicits staff feedback on school-wide procedures and creates opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests.

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. 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 - The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches 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 under-served students.