

Brevard Public Schools

Oak Park Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

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: 2/5/2018

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	TS&I
* 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Oak Park Elementary School

3395 DAIRY RD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>78%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>43%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

Oak Park will work together to provide all students with every opportunity to reach their full academic potential. (Revised 2014)

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Oak Park community will work as a team to foster success in our students.(Revised 2014)

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mulchrone, Susan	Principal	<p>Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process with fidelity, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, and guarantees adequate professional development to support implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. School administrators ensure that collaborative planning time is used productively and reflected in general and special education staff schedules and instructional plans. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>
Turner, Kasie	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal: Assists principal and provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process with fidelity, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, and guarantees adequate professional development to support implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. School administrators ensure that collaborative planning time is used productively and reflected in general and special education staff schedules and instructional plans. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>
Allen, Heather	Instructional Coach	<p>Literacy Coach: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan and best practices in literacy; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans. Conducts walk-throughs and uses the coaching cycle with teachers. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>
Cisko, Lisa	Other	<p>MTSS coordinator: Identifies systematic patterns of students' needs to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>
Leaman, Maria	Instructional Coach	<p>Math coach: Provides guidance on K-12 math plan and best practices in math; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans. Conducts classroom walk-throughs and uses the coaching model with teachers. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>
Pennerman, Gregory	Instructional Coach	<p>Science Coach: Provides guidance on K-6 science plan and best practices in science; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning. Also co-teaches and models lessons. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>
Kerr, Sandra	Other	<p>Teacher on Assignment: Identifies systematic patterns of students' needs to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>
Poley, Danielle	Other	<p>PBIS coach: Provides guidance on PBIS and Sanford Harmony and best practices in student discipline; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	66	75	108	93	82	96	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	27	14	14	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	5	19	9	7	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	23	34	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

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	3	8	2	9	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

68

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/6/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	13	72	44	53	50	49	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
One or more suspensions	1	9	6	6	6	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	49	62	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	170

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	1	9	6	2	30	35	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	62%	57%	48%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	60%	58%	57%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	57%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	46%	63%	63%	46%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	65%	62%	59%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	51%	54%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	57%	53%	38%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	66 (0)	75 (0)	108 (0)	93 (0)	82 (0)	96 (0)	87 (0)	607 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	1 ()	27 ()	14 ()	14 ()	9 ()	20 ()	87 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	5 ()	19 ()	9 ()	7 ()	17 ()	15 ()	73 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	4 ()	23 ()	34 ()	47 ()	108 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
	2018	47%	63%	-16%	57%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
	2018	36%	57%	-21%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	27%	60%	-33%	56%	-29%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2019	50%	60%	-10%	54%	-4%
	2018	42%	63%	-21%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%
	2018	32%	62%	-30%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
	2018	43%	59%	-16%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
05	2019	32%	60%	-28%	60%	-28%
	2018	49%	58%	-9%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	52%	67%	-15%	55%	-3%
	2018	48%	68%	-20%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	29%	56%	-27%	53%	-24%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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				
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				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	18	33	31	23	51	50	28				
BLK	35	59	62	27	57	56	15				
HSP	57	56	55	49	58	40	36				
MUL	44	46		50	50						
WHT	51	58	49	51	61	55	44				
FRL	41	55	54	39	55	51	31				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	31
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	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
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	47
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 performing data component was in Science. There was a decrease from 45% in 2018 to 31% in 2019. Our overall ELA performance also demonstrated a decrease from 44% in 2018 to 42% in 2019. The lowest 25% learning gains for ELA remained stagnant at 44% for 2018 and 2019. High yield instructional practices, collaborative structures, and standards-aligned learning tasks were lacking and were first implemented and introduced in 2019. There was also a realignment of grade level teachers based on teacher strengths and student needs. Fifth grade is also departmentalizing this year.

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

The data component that had the greatest decline was in Science. There was a decrease from 45% in 2018 to 31% in 2019. High yield instructional practices with incorporated hands-on science were lacking. In addition, progress monitoring was lacking along with reteaching practices, and collaborative planning was also lacking. The loss of our science coach that had to be placed in the classroom also contributed to this decline.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science. The state average for science in 2019 was 53% and Oak Park's science state average was 31%. This was a difference of 22%. High yield instructional practices with incorporated hands-on science was lacking. In addition progress monitoring was lacking along with reteaching practices, and collaborative planning was also lacking. The loss of our science coach that had to be placed in the classroom also contributed to this decline.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were learning gains in ELA which increased from 40% in 2018 to 48% in 2019 and also the lowest 25% learning gains in math which increased from 32% in 2018 to 41% in 2019. The new actions that were taken in ELA that contributed to the increase were the addition of a MTSS coordinator that monitored and worked with teachers to deliver research based interventions such as LLI, as well as lessons from the Teacher Toolbox from i-Ready coupled with the instructional portion of i-Ready for all students in both reading and math. Small group instruction was implemented using the instructional grouping of students from the i-Ready diagnostics. In math, there was the addition of an extra thirty minutes that were incorporated into the master schedule for math which allowed for intervention time in math. Lessons from the Teacher Toolbox were also implemented with small groups as identified by the i-Ready diagnostics. The addition of a math coach also assisted teachers with collaborative planning to the Florida Standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The area of concern from the EWS data is discipline. There were 978 discipline referrals in 2019 with seventy three students having more than one referral.

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

1. Increase proficiency in Science
2. Increase proficiency and learning gains in ELA
3. Increase proficiency and learning gains in Math
4. Decrease student discipline referrals

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Proficiency in Science
Rationale	Science proficiency in fifth graders was 31% which is below the state (53%) and district (57%) averages and have been inconsistent for the past three years.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase science proficiency in 5th graders from 31% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	5 E Model of inquiry, Job-embedded coaching, Differentiation and reteaching, and "hands-on" science lab activities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If students are engaged in "hands-on" science lab activities and have an increased science vocabulary through science instruction, then science proficiency scores will increase. Students have not been engaged in critical thinking about science or actively engaged "hands-on" science lab activities and have not had instruction in science vocabulary.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development of the the 5 E model of teaching science for third through fifth grade teachers provided by the school and district science coach. 2. Support provided to the teachers by the science instructional coach who was funded by Title I funds and the district science coach to collaboratively plan and to provide feedback to teachers on science instruction that includes vocabulary and "hands-on" engagement through lab activities. 3. Increase time in the science block in the master schedule with clearly set science expectations for instruction and use of the science lab. 4. Science grade level data meetings will be scheduled to discuss science mini-assessments to determine differentiation for instruction and reteaching practices. 5. Provide Harris Super Science Saturdays
Person Responsible	Gregory Pennerman (pennerman.gregory@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Proficiency and Learning Gains in ELA
Rationale	Three years of FSA data has shown a gradual decline in ELA proficiency from 48%, 44% and then to 42% in 2019. Oak Park continues to score below the state average of 57% and the district average of 62%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA proficiency will increase from 42% to 47%. ELA learning gains will increase from 48% to 53%, and the lowest 25% learning gains will increase from 44% to 49%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards aligned instruction with standards aligned learning tasks using grade level appropriate complex text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem is occurring because the instruction is misaligned to the Florida standards and learning tasks that are developed are also misaligned to those standards. Grade level appropriate complex text is not consistently used.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with one day per quarter (4 per year) to common plan with a coach and an administrator to build standards aligned ELA instruction and create standards aligned learning tasks. 2. An Instructional Focus Calendar will be created for all teachers in all grade levels and classroom walk-throughs will be completed by the coaches and the administration. 3. Teachers and the leadership team will meet weekly at grade level team data meetings to discuss individual student data, monitor subgroups and plan for small group and tiered instruction based on student's instructional needs. 4. The leadership team will collaborate to discuss and analyze data to tier teachers and plan for targeted coaching support which includes observational feedback regarding effective implementation of standards aligned instruction. 5. Provide teachers with professional development to incorporate i-Ready Teacher Toolbox grade level appropriate lessons during small group instruction and provide observation and feedback to teachers on implementation. 6. Provide teachers with professional development to increase teacher's pedagogy by using the i-Ready standards mastery assessments for reading. 7. Instructional groups will be made in i-Ready to monitor progress of students with disabilities and the lowest 25%.
Person Responsible	Heather Allen (allen.heather@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Proficiency in Math and Learning Gains
Rationale	Three years of FSA data have shown overall stagnant growth from 46%, 44% to 46% in 2019. Oak Park's math proficiency continues to be below the district average of 63% and the state average of 63%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math proficiency will increase from 46% to 51%. Math learning gains will increase from 53% to 58%, and the lowest 25% learning gains will increase from 41% to 46%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards aligned instruction with standards aligned learning tasks using the Eureka math curriculum
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem is occurring because the instruction is misaligned to the Florida standards and learning tasks that are developed are also misaligned to those standards. A consistent curriculum that utilizes student problem solving skills in math is lacking.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with one day per quarter (4 per year) to common plan with a coach and an administrator to build standards aligned math instruction and create standards aligned learning tasks using Eureka math. 2. An Instructional Focus Calendar will be created for all teachers in all grade levels. 3. Teachers and the leadership team will meet weekly at grade level team data meetings to discuss individual student data, monitor subgroups and plan for small group and tiered instruction based on students instructional needs. 4. The leadership team will collaborate to discuss and analyze data to tier teachers and plan for targeted coaching support which includes observational feedback regarding effective implementation of standards aligned instruction. 5. Provide teachers with professional development to increase teacher's pedagogy by using the i-Ready standards mastery assessments for math. 6. Teachers will receive Standards Focus Board Professional Development. 7. A Standards Focus Boards will be displayed strategically in a central location in every classroom for math for the purpose of guiding the focus of the instruction for teachers as well as defining the purpose for learning for students. 8. Instructional groups will be made in i-Ready to monitor progress of students with disabilities and the lowest 25%.
Person Responsible	Maria Leaman (leaman.maria@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	Student Discipline
Rationale	Out of schools suspensions is an indicator of at risk students in the Early Warning System. The past two years have seen an upward trend of increased office referrals across all grade levels from 733 in 2018 to 978 referrals in 2019.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The total amount of discipline referrals will decrease by 25% from 978 to 734 discipline referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS Tier I through Tier III, Sanford Harmony
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers require strategies for communicating clear expectations of rules and procedures to students and holding students accountable for their actions. A sense of community is lacking both in the classroom and school-wide. A school-wide approach to facilitate positive interdependent relationships and social responsibility among all students with and without disabilities across all general education and natural contexts is also lacking.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The master schedule will be adjusted to allow all grade levels thirty minutes at the beginning of the school day to implement Sanford Harmony and classroom circles to build a sense of classroom community. 2. Sanford Harmony strategies will be instituted to support building teacher-student relationships and increased student engagement to promote and support improved student behavior. 3. Professional development will be provided to teachers by the PBIS coach who was Title I funded to support classroom management and student engagement through Tier I through Tier III PBIS and Sanford Harmony strategies. 4. Student recognition (PBIS) activities will be scheduled to award students for excellent behavior and support improved student behavior by increasing the amount of Eagle Bucks that are awarded to students through the electronic PBIS system. 5. Students with three or more referrals will be immediately referred to the MTSS behavior team to write an individual behavior intervention plan for the student.
Person Responsible	Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Oak Park currently has minimal parent involvement. To reach more parents, a monthly newsletter, school website, social media and the use of Blackboard Connect through voice messages and text messages will be employed. Oak Park will also provide each family a printed calendar of events for the entire school year. We have also added more evening programs and family activities both academic and non-academic each month.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The PBIS coach and the leadership team monitor office referrals and individual students with Behavior Intervention Plans. When students are identified to have social-emotional needs, the school counselor and school social worker will meet with the students and contact parents to provide a counseling referral so that all of the students are provided with any services that they may need both inside and outside of the school. Oak Park is implementing Sanford Harmony this year to address the social emotional well being of our students. PBIS data is shared monthly with staff.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Oak Park assesses all students prior to entering Kindergarten. English Language Learners are given an initial screening to see if they qualify for ESOL services. All students are also assessed with the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) and the i-Ready diagnostic. A Kindergarten Round-Up is held for all incoming Kindergarteners and their families in April. Information about Kindergarten readiness is distributed to all families.

Guidance counselors and administration from the middle school come to speak about middle school to our sixth graders. Parent nights are held at the middle school so that parents have a thorough understanding of the middle school. A math assessment is administered to all sixth graders to aid the middle school with proper placement of the students in middle school math classes.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The leadership team meets once per week to address the academic and social-emotional needs of the students. Great level team meetings are held at least monthly to help coordinate the MTSS process. The school's academic and behavioral goals are monitored through data gathering and data analysis.

Title I Part A: Oak Park Elementary receives federal funding from the Title I program. The amount

received for this school year is \$481,460. The money is used to provide salaries for a MTSS/Title I/ Parent Involvement Coordinator, a Literacy Coach, A Math Coach, a Science Coach, a PBIS behavior coach and two instructional assistants. Money is allocated for technology.

Title I Part C Migrant: 0 students

Title I Part D: The district handles this level of Title I money.

Title II: Professional Development is provided to the teachers through the District Professional Office.

Title III: Sixteen ESOL students and one ESOL instructional assistant.

Title X Homeless: The district receives money to support homeless students through a resource teacher at the district office. 29 students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction: SAI program through ASP with a focus on Literacy and Math.

Violence Prevention Program: Two guidance counselors.

Nutrition Programs: School wide free breakfast and lunch program. Qualified for a grant for this school year through Run United.

Other Programs: Kiwanis-shoes, Dental Sealant Program, Kennedy Space Center, Science Fair, Odyssey of the Mind, 21st Century Grant and fifth and sixth grade orchestra.

The school leadership team meets on a weekly basis to review data, monitor student progress, problem solve issues identified in student data and reflect on walk-throughs and observations conducted throughout the school. The team's purpose is to monitor the progress towards our SIP goals. The leadership team will assist teachers and identify specific professional development needs.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Oak Park will coordinate with Bethune-Cookman University in the 2019-2020 school year. The university will provide athletic and education students that will act as mentors for our students.

Each teacher will proudly display their college banner in their classroom to promote college readiness.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Proficiency in Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Proficiency and Learning Gains in ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Proficiency in Math and Learning Gains	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00