

Pinellas County Schools

Southern Oak Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Southern Oak Elementary School

9101 WALSINGHAM RD, Largo, FL 33773

<http://www.southern-oak.pinellas.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Susan Taylor J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2020-21: (51%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Pinellas 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.

Southern Oak's mission is to educate and prepare each student for college, career and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southern Oak's vision is 100% student success for every child.

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
Moss, Jeffrey	Principal	
Jessie, Brandie	Assistant Principal	
Finn, Courtney	Instructional Coach	
Taylor, Alma	Attendance/Social Work	
Hamilton, Krista	Guidance Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Susan Taylor J

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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

528

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

2

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

1

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	79	82	82	92	86	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	26	36	26	24	24	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	2	8	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	0	0	0	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/27/2022

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	43	87	80	94	83	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	22	22	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	33	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	33	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	5	3	3	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

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	43	87	80	94	83	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	22	22	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	33	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	33	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	5	3	3	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

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	57%			49%			55%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%			53%			58%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%			41%			56%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	69%			65%			55%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	71%			55%			57%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%			35%			47%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	48%			60%			45%	53%	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	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

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	27	43		59	64						
ELL	45	60		68	80						
BLK	50	67		50	61						
HSP	44	48		59	67						
MUL	67			73							
WHT	61	64	35	75	75	72	54				
FRL	48	58	38	61	65	65	43				

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	15	27		33	45						
ELL	15			44							
BLK	52			61							
HSP	26	17		55	42		40				
MUL	50			61							
WHT	55	61	45	70	61	40	65				
FRL	45	53		68	57		64				
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	12	36		19	57						
ELL	39	66	67	32	47	58	27				
BLK	68	58		68	73		50				
HSP	48	69	81	43	49	54	43				
MUL	20			40							
WHT	56	54	48	57	56	48	45				
FRL	49	56	54	51	52	43	40				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
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	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	70
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	62
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Historically, Southern Oak students have performed higher on Math assessments than reading and that trend has continued through the 21-22 school year. Our Reading proficiency is 57% in 2022, compared to 69% Math proficiency. Our focus this year will be to increase the capacity of teachers to differentiate their instruction to increase the proficiency of all students in reading, with a focus on the lowest quartile. Standards based instruction and collaborative planning will be the bedrocks of our work in all subject areas.

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

The greatest need for improvement based on 2022 FSA and cycle assessment data is the achievement of the lowest quartile of students in ELA. The learning gains of those students were 36%, as opposed to the 62% Learning Gains for the overall student population. As our students' ELA proficiency increases, their Science and Math proficiency scores will increase as well.

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

Standards based instruction, data analysis and collaborative planning must occur in order to increase student proficiency in all areas and to ensure at least one year of growth for each student. Professional development will be focused on ELA best teaching practices. Data chats will be scheduled with teachers throughout the year to be sure that each and every student's needs are known and met.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The learning gains of our 4th grade students in Math were above 70% which is the highest they've ever been. As previously stated, the Math proficiency of all students, grades K-5, are cause for celebration. Math proficiency is 69% overall and learning gains were 71% overall. Learning gains of the lowest 25% are 64%.

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

Teachers were involved in module rollout trainings and were aware of the progression of the standards in order to fill gaps in learning that might have been present. All students participated in the Dreambox online learning program to increase proficiency. Our Extended Learning Program (ELP) focused on core ELA and Math instruction for our L25 population as well.

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

Standards based instruction and collaborative planning will be continued. A book study with a focus on equity will take place during the first semester. Ongoing data chats will be scheduled throughout the year to ensure acceleration of the learning of every student, those exceeding expectations and those below grade level proficiency.

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.

There will be a book study to examine the book Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain offered during the first quarter of the school year. The book Shifting the Balance will be studied during the second quarter. PD focused on BEST standards will also be planned and embedded in PLCs. Data chats will be calendared around cycle assessments. Teachers will track data and students will be aware of their progress by keeping individual data folders.

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

An extended learning program will be offered to students who are struggling in one or more subject areas in order to decrease the gap between grade level expectations and their performance. We will also have enrichment clubs for those students in need of acceleration. All teachers will be trained in BEST standards and will understand the progression of the standards in order to prepare students for the upcoming school year.

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**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Standards based data (FSA, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math and Science with a lack of consistency in effective interventions for students who are substantially deficient in a subject area. Students are not provided with consistent scaffolding activities to support the ones who are not successful with grade level content. ELA Learning Gains of the L25 are at 36% based on 2022 FSA data.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

As measured by state assessments in April/May: proficiency in ELA will increase from 57% to 65%. Proficiency in Math will increase from 69% to 70%. Proficiency in Science will increase from 48% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration team will review grade level data and projected proficiency reports during each assessment cycle to monitor progress toward schoolwide goals.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Instruction must be aligned to the standards in order to be rigorous enough to increase student achievement. When students are engaged in aligned lessons, they are more readily able to incorporate collaborative team talk, comprehend standards-based tasks, retain the level of learning necessary to make gains and achieve proficiency. As the strength in teacher knowledge of aligned lessons grows, effective and creative teaching strategies strengthen, and engagement and learning also increase.

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.

Teachers will facilitate collaborative student learning and showcase interactive and project based tasks. Students will be provided consistent opportunities to engage in complex grade level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will be provided professional development opportunities to strengthen their understanding of student acquisition of oral language. Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction and intervention where acceleration can occur more rapidly by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback, etc.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group instruction, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

Ensure appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st-5th grade standards. Utilize standards progression and systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 3 I's instructional strategy (Ignite, Investigate, and Inform Instruction.)

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction in mathematics. Teachers will identify each students' proficiency levels and relative areas of strength and need, and will implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key concepts.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

Administrators will plan and participate in ongoing data chats where teachers track data and plan for instruction based on student progress and performance. Teachers will implement goal setting opportunities where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data, and celebrating successes.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

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

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

Southern Oak has more than 10 students in the ELL, Hispanic and SWD categories and there is a gap between their achievement and that of the total student body.

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

We will increase the performance of all subgroups to at least 41% based on statewide assessments given in April/May of 2023.

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

Identify and monitor the number of ELL, Hispanic and SWD students participating in enrichment activities such as: STEM, ELP, chorus, art opportunities, etc. District assessments, weekly ELP attendance, coaching logs and STEM rosters will be used to monitor this area of focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

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

Students will work toward mastery of grade level standards. Best teaching practices will be implemented in classrooms such as: cooperative and small group tasks, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback, foundational skills related to each student's individual area of need, engaging in rigorous grade level content.

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

Differentiated and standards based planning must occur to increase the proficiency of all students in subgroups. Daily walkthroughs with actionable feedback will be provided for each teacher to support them in improving conditions for the learning of every student.

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.

Ensure that students in subgroups are participating in extended learning opportunities (i.e. STEM, Promise Time, Clubs, Enrichment, Rising Kindergarten Program, etc.) before and after school through recruitment by teachers, staff, and administrators. Targeted research based resources will be utilized, and participation will be evidenced by phone logs, parent conference forms, parent training attendance logs, and Open House/ Family Involvement sign-in sheets.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

Provide opportunities for specialists and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services. Teachers and specialists will collaboratively plan for grade level, student-

centered complex tasks, deliberately planned with a trajectory of rigor and challenge, utilizing appropriate ESE and ELL strategies including higher level questioning and explicit vocabulary instruction.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

Teachers will use evidence based practices for students with disabilities and English language learners to teach foundational literacy and math skills.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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

Southern Oak Elementary does not historically have a gap between the achievement of all students and that of African American students. In order to maintain their achievement levels, equity will be intentionally and thoughtfully planned and tasks will be consistently aligned to grade level appropriate standards.

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

The proficiency of African American students will meet or exceed that of the total student body in all subject areas (ELA, Math, Science) as measured by state assessments given in April/May.

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

Progress toward achieving this goal will be monitored by cycle assessments, administrator walkthrough data and classroom data throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

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

Students will be provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards aligned tasks and teachers will use effective teaching methods to support learning.

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

Students provided with standards aligned tasks have a greater opportunity to be successful on state assessments.

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.

Teachers will become familiar with the design of the B.E.S.T. standards in order to effectively plan for instruction and standards aligned tasks.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

A book study (Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain) will be offered to all teachers and staff in order to engage in conversations regarding various aspects of differentiation and equitable instruction.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Moss (mossj@pcsb.org)

Teachers will instruct students to strengthen their inquiry skills through the implementation and monitoring of routine use of higher level thinking through questioning, class discussions, problem solving activities and/or collaborative study groups.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction where acceleration can occur more rapidly by insuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school based professional development, cycles of coaching and feedback.

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

Utilize new curriculum materials to create a common foundation of standards aligned rigorous expectations for all students.

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)

Common assessment data will show that at least 60% of students in grades K-2 are performing at or above proficiency. This will be at least a 10% increase for each grade level.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students in grades 3-5 will perform at least 59% proficiency in ELA as measured by state grade level assessments. This will be at least a 10% increase over 2022 assessment data.

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.

Progress toward these goals will be monitored by cycle assessment data, classroom assessment data and administrator walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Moss, Jeffrey, mossj@pcsb.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?

ELA Champions will establish demonstration classrooms at each grade level where ELA teachers will learn from and inspire one another.

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?

ELA Champions will be chosen at each grade level who will receive ELA standards based professional development which they will bring back to their teams during a PLC.

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
Literacy Coaching by on-site MTSS Coach for all teachers in grades K-5.	Finn, Courtney, finnc@pcsb.org
Literacy Leadership	Moss, Jeffrey, mossj@pcsb.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.

Southern Oak Elementary promotes a positive school culture by gaining input from stakeholders regarding PBIS initiatives. Students are given the opportunity to request incentives and rewards for following the schoolwide guidelines for success (Be Safe, Be Responsible, Be Kind, Be Respectful.) A system of recognition is established to acknowledge adherence to guidelines. A school store is stocked and students are able to earn Hoot Loot for following guidelines. Expectations are posted in common areas. All staff in common areas will engage with students to provide feedback regarding their behavior.

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

Southern Oak Elementary has an SBLT (School Based Leadership Team) and a PBIS team to review schoolwide discipline data and to revise PBIS plans as needed. The SBLT is also responsible for professional development to be sure that all staff members are aware of the guidelines for success and the expectations of students and staff schoolwide.