

Brevard Public Schools

# Oak Park Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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: 9/4/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (41%) 2020-21: (33%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (43%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&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](http://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**

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McDonough, Adrea	Principal	
Wehrly, Katherine	Assistant Principal	
Leach, Chelsea	Instructional Coach	
Mayo, Tonja	Teacher, K-12	TOA
Pennerman, Gregory	Science Coach	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 9/4/2022, Adrea Mcdonough L

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

46

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

493

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

13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	53	76	73	61	41	73	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	462
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	13	19	10	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	8	6	10	5	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	4	19	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	32	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	17	39	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	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 who have 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	2	7	1	11	15	35	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	2	9	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Sunday 9/4/2022

**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	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

**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	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

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%	61%	56%	38%			42%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	63%	61%	45%			48%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	54%	52%	39%			44%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	33%	60%	60%	38%			46%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%	64%	64%	30%			53%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	55%	55%	19%			41%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	56%	51%	25%			31%	57%	53%



**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	27%	60%	-33%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
06	2022					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	32%	60%	-28%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2022					
	2019	52%	67%	-15%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	29%	56%	-27%	53%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	33	18	24	40	29	32				
ELL	27	36		27	64						
BLK	25	41	37	15	38	20	29				
HSP	41	35		41	61						
MUL	40	47		23	53						
WHT	42	49	38	42	56	73	43				
FRL	34	43	27	26	47	43	37				
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				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	41

Multiracial Students	
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 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	49
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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 21-22 data shows students are significantly below district averages in 3+ proficiency in ELA [ 37%], Math [33%] and Science [38%].

\*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 (37% 3+)

Grade level 2022 FSA ELA data is as follows:

3rd grade - 37% proficient on FSA ELA

4th grade - 31%

5th grade - 39%

6th grade- 38%

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

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

The two lowest performing cells are ELA Lowest percentile performing at 33% 3+ proficiency and Math achievement at 33% 3+ proficiency. As identified as an ESSA sub groups, data SY 2022 shows SWD 21% 3+ and African American subgroup 25% 3+ continue to be under performing. ELA and Math proficiency 3+ continues to be below district averages ELA (38%) (58%) Math (33%) (58%).

**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 (29.5% Black/African American & 49.7% of White 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Math learning gains was our highest performing cell (52%), still under performing the district (57%), so 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?**

Utilizing data from i-Ready to support needed areas of scaffolding and effective MTSS problem solving process made an impact on student progress.

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

- Quality of Implementation of ELA and new Math Curriculum
- Walk to Intervention-data driven
- Penda and i-Ready usage, monitoring and incentivizing passed lessons/PENDA Mastery of lessons
- Data Chats
- Small Group Instruction
- Monitoring L35%
- Mentors- Peer support and goal setting in addition to SEL.
- MTSS bi-weekly data talks with a data wall. Incorporate into GLM.
- Cycle of Improvement: Collaborative planning with Literacy Coach/Math Coach, , intentional PD, tiered PD, learning walks with feedback
- Academic Support Program
- Extended Day

**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:

- Kagan Strategies for Engagement
- BEST Standards training and implementation
- ELA and new Math Curriculum implementation
- Writing
- Penda with Fidelity
- Penda Assessments with Fidelity
- i-Ready with Fidelity in both Reading and Mat
- Magnetic Reader (Foundational Skills Program) K-2
- MAFS and LAFS training-3-6
- Data analysis training and ways data can be used to inform instruction
- Teach Like a Champion, Zones, PBIS, Composure/Conscious Discipline

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

- Classroom Teachers, Administration and Eagle Supporters will monitor i-Read usage/pass rate and PENDA usage/pass rate and provide feedback on ways to improve instruction
- Grade levels will meet bi-weekly to intentionally, collaboratively plan as a required Friday PD for grade level (PD calendar for the entire year-scheduled)
- Literacy Coach/District Math Coach and Administration will conduct a cycle of improvement: Provide professional development, conduct a walk through the next week and provide feedback. Additional PD will be provided to tiered teachers of need
- Bi-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" strategies year two/year one for new teachers. Leadership and Instructional Coaches are building schoolwide coaching and feedback systems via implementation of strategies from "Get Better Faster" (2020, Santoyo)
- School-wide Title I Data Nights for families, Action Steps provided to families on ways to improve in reading, math and behavior (One data night per semester-calendared)
- Bi-weekly Kid Talk meetings to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior plans and discuss students having difficulty following PBIS schoolwide S.O.A.R. expectations

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

ELA- For the past three years, the percentage of our students scoring 3+ on ELA FSA has been below the district and state averages. SY 21-22 (37% 3+)

2022 FSA ELA data:  
 3rd grade – (37% 3+)  
 4th grade – (31% 3+)  
 5th grade – (39% 3+)

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 21-22 (33% 3+)

Science for the past three years has been below district averages. SY 21-22 (38% 3+)

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

i-Ready Reading & Math D3 2021-2022 and Monthly Goals for 2022-2023  
 D3 Oct. Feb.

Grade	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
K	>>>>>>>>	30%	30%	50%	50%	
1st	71%	64%	75%	67%	80%	75%
2nd	43%	47%	47%	55%	63%	67%
3rd	27%	31%	37%	40%	50%	50%
4th	53%	31%	55%	41%	63%	50%
5th	31%	43%	41%	47%	51%	53%
6th	40%	35%	45%	40%	55%	50%

F.A.S.T. data proficiency by grade & Goals for PM 2 and 3  
 P1 P2 P3

Grade	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
Kinder	44%	47%	50%	55%	60%	60%
First	38%	69%	45%	73%	55%	79%
Second	34%	74%	40%	80%	50%	85%
Third	13%	31%	37%	40%	50%	50%
Fourth	20%	31%	30%	41%	50%	50%
Fifth	22%	43%	41%	47%	51%	53%

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

Sixth 33% 35% 45% 40% 55% 50%

Science  
2021 2022 2023  
25 38 50

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

- ELA, Math and Science Standards-Aligned Instruction:
- A cycle for improvement will be implemented:
  - Collaborative Planning with Literacy Coach/Math Coach & Administration
  - Learning Walks & Feedback
  - Tiered Professional Development on specific areas of need from walk throughs
    - Implementation & Modeling
    - Walk through and feedback
- Intervention for ELA and Math with Fidelity
  - Data will be monitored bi-weekly at data team meetings and Eagle Support Meetings
- Science
  - PENDA Mastery and Assessment Data will be monitored bi-weekly

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

- Standards-aligned district curriculum implementation for Reading, Math and Science
  - Explicit instruction
  - Systematic instruction
  - Scaffolded Instruction
- Collaborative Planning Reading and Math
- 95% Group Reading Intervention
- Lexia Reading
- I-Ready Reading and Math
- PENDA Science

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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:

- 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

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.



**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**

- Early Release Fridays will be utilized for three collaborative planning sessions per semester with Literacy Coach and Administration
- Teachers will collaboratively work to increase understanding and implementation of best practice writing strategies for instruction
- Bi-weekly data meetings will be held by Literacy Coach, Administration, and Teachers to monitor, track and adjust for ongoing progress of i-Ready diagnostics, the State-Monitoring Tool, PASI, PSI and 95% Group Interventions and Benchmark Assessments (T).
- Teachers will track and monitor ESSA subgroup data for ongoing progress of i-Ready diagnostics, State-Monitoring tool, and benchmark assessments (T)
- 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

**Person Responsible**

Chelsea Leach (leach.chelsea@brevardschools.org)

**Math**

- Benchmark-aligned planning sessions facilitated by Math Coach (monthly)
- 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 training
- Teachers will provide small group instruction daily based on data
- Teachers will embed Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning standards within planned lessons
- Academic support tutoring provided to students before and/or after school (T1)

**Person Responsible**

Katherine Wehrly (wehrly.katherine@brevardschools.org)

**Science**

- Standards-aligned planning with Title I Teacher
- Administration, Eagle Supporters, and Teachers will track and monitor PENDA Mastery data and PENDA assessment data
- Teachers will have students track PENDA data on PENDA Journals
- Title I teacher will 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"
- Spiraling 3rd and 4th grade standards for 5th graders
- Fifth graders will be invited to five Super Science Saturdays (T1)

**Person Responsible**

Gregory Pennerman (pennerman.gregory@brevardschools.org)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### 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

- D3 i-Ready data from 21-22 shows that 53% of students in grades K-2 are not on track to score grade level

or above on the state wide ELA assessment.

- 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 relating to Reading/ELA

21-22 FSA Data shows 63% of 3rd Graders, 69% of 4th Graders and 61% 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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)**

i-Ready Reading D3 2021-2022 and Monthly Goals for 2022-2023

D3 Oct. Feb.

Grade ELA Math ELA Math ELA Math

Kinder >>>>>>> 30% 30% 50% 50%

First 71% 64% 75% 67% 80% 75%

Second 43% 47% 47% 55% 63% 67%

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

Kinder 44% 50% 60%

First 38% 45% 55%

Second 34% 40% 50%

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

i-Ready Reading D3 2021-2022 and Monthly Goals for 2022-2023

D3 Oct. Feb.

Grade ELA ELA ELA

Third 27% 37% 50%

Fourth 53% 55% 63%

Fifth 31% 41% 51%

Sixth 40% 45% 55%

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

Third 13% 37% 50%

Fourth 20% 30% 50%

Fifth 22% 41% 51%

Sixth 33% 45% 55%

**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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

- 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.

Leach, Chelsea, leach.chelsea@brevardschools.org

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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. Â§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, i-Ready, 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 Magnetic Reading Curriculum Associates materials twenty to thirty minutes daily to enhance foundational skills. Grades three through sixth will utilize LAFS to support gaps in instruction.

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 for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 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
-------------	-----------------------------------

- 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.
- Literacy Coaching:
- Coaching Cycle
  - 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.)
- Assessment
- Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI
  - Identify Tier 2 and Tier 3
  - Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, and intervention OPM
- Professional Learning
- provide PD/coaching
  - Train on Instruction/Intervention Materials
  - Identify mentor teachers and establish model classrooms

McDonough, Adrea,  
[mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org](mailto:mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

**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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2021-2022 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. A weekly news will be sent to families to increase family communication. A monthly news will also be sent to families the last week of the month to ensure families are made aware of upcoming events and calendared dates. (T1)

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. Bi-weekly PLC/ Closing the Attitude Gap (T1) and Kid Talk 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. Staff members utilize a SEL log to proactively address potentially escalating situations. S.O.A.R. expectations are reinforced by elective activities twice a week or a correctional strategy to reteach the expectations. As students earn S.O.A.R. bucks for following expectations throughout campus, we offer a school store to spend their bucks.(T1) Students can purchase items from basic needs to extra curricular items and toys that they may not be possible to purchase otherwise. A S.O.A.R. fun day for students is offered every other month. Students spend their bucks to attend.

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 and teacher retention. 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". (T1) Administration and Leadership planned a teacher "Boot Camp" during the month of July. New teachers to Oak Park were invited five days to attend the camp. (T1) Leaders taught participants about curriculum, Teach Like a Champion, PBIS, Zones of Regulation, De-escalation strategies, Sanford Harmony and general school-wide procedures and policies.

Additionally, we will implement research based SEL curriculum to provide targeted instruction to help ease the impact of emotional hardships from things such as 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 school culture and environment.**

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 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:

- Collaborative 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)

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/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 under-served 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.