# Oak Ridge Elementary School

# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Oak Ridge Elementary School

## 4530 SHELFER RD, Tallahassee, FL 32305

### https://www.leonschools.net/oakridge

**Demographics**

## Principal: Jasmine Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (39%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Jeff Sewell |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | N/A |
| **Support Tier** | N/A |
| **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 Leon 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

The mission of Oak Ridge Elementary School is to prepare students to become responsible, respectful, independent learners equipped with the critical thinking skills necessary to compete in our global society.

### Provide the school's vision statement

Oak Ridge Elementary School will be an engaging, safe, and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

## School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Smith, Jasmine | Principal | The principal and the assistant principal ensure teachers are trained on curriculum, including intervention program materials. The administration also conducts informal and formal observations to identify areas of need and to find role models for other teachers. Also, the administration has oversight in ensuring that pacing and planning are on target for students to show achievement. Finally, administration ensures that data is being monitored and that informal and formal assessments are being disaggregated in order to find strengths and weaknesses. These strengths and weaknesses will be used to guide instruction on an ongoing basis. |
| Martin, Terri | Assistant Principal | The principal and the assistant principal ensure teachers are trained on curriculum, including intervention program materials. The administration also conducts informal and formal observations to identify areas of need and to find role models for other teachers. Also, the administration has oversight in ensuring that pacing and planning are on target for students to show achievement. Finally, administration ensures that data is being monitored and that informal and formal assessments are being disaggregated in order to find strengths and weaknesses. These strengths and weaknesses will be used to guide instruction on an ongoing basis. |
| Arnold, Albert | Dean | The student dean will assist teachers in protecting instructional time. Any disruptive behaviors will be dealt with in a timely manner. The Dean will also assist in contacting families concerning student needs. |
| Hill, Baleasa | Instructional Coach | The instructional coaches will plan weekly with teachers using the Florida Standards and learning progressions. They will also model and observe informally as often as needed to guarantee that teachers are following the sequence of instruction. The coaches will work with district coaches to ensure that all instructional needs of teachers are met. |
| Cole, Antwan | Instructional Coach | The instructional coaches will plan weekly with teachers using the Florida standards and learning progressions. They will also model and observe informally as often as needed to guarantee that teachers are following the sequence of instruction. The coaches will work with district coaches to ensure that all instructional needs of teachers are met. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Muhammad, Aquila | Instructional Coach | The instructional coaches will plan weekly with teachers using the Florida standards and learning progressions. They will also model and observe informally as often as needed to guarantee that teachers are following the sequence of instruction. The coaches will work with district coaches to ensure that all instructional needs of teachers are met. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 7/10/2017, Jasmine Smith

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

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
42

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 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 |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (33%) |

| | 2016-17: D (40%) |
| --- | --- |
| | 2015-16: D (39%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information\*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Jeff Sewell](#) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | N/A |
| **Support Tier** | N/A |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| \* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). | |

## 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 | 67 | 66 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 388 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 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 | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

**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 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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

Wednesday 6/24/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 75 | 76 | 69 | 69 | 63 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 23 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**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 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

### 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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 75 | 76 | 69 | 69 | 63 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 23 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**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 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

# 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% | 57% | 57% | 37% | 57% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 49% | 54% | 58% | 39% | 53% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 47% | 53% | 33% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 57% | 64% | 63% | 33% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 66% | 63% | 62% | 36% | 55% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 45% | 51% | 21% | 40% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 30% | 52% | 53% | 32% | 52% | 55% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (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.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 30% | 61% | -31% | 58% | -28% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 61% | -21% | 57% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 51% | 57% | -6% | 58% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 30% | 58% | -28% | 56% | -26% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 21% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 35% | 56% | -21% | 56% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 57% | -29% | 55% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 43% | 63% | -20% | 62% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 64% | -33% | 62% | -31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 75% | 66% | 9% | 64% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 62% | -21% | 62% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 34% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 44% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 41% | 61% | -20% | 60% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 18% | 58% | -40% | 61% | -43% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 23% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | 26% | 54% | -28% | 53% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 56% | -28% | 55% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 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 2016-17** | **C & C Accel 2016-17** |
| SWD | 32 | 26 | 25 | 45 | 38 | 25 | 29 | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 48 | 49 | 56 | 64 | 42 | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 30 | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 48 | 47 | 57 | 66 | 46 | 27 | | | | |

### 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 29 | 30 | 27 | 23 | 24 | 7 | 8 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 38 | 34 | 34 | 35 | 23 | 31 | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | | | 17 | 30 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 38 | 30 | | 31 | 40 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 37 | 33 | 29 | 33 | 22 | 27 | | | | |

### 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 | 48 |
| 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 | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 335 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 46 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 35 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 47 |
| 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**

ELA proficiency is our lowest performance component across several data sources. On the 2019 FSA, our students scored at 42% proficiency. The 2019 winter benchmark from STAR indicated that 50% of our students were proficient. The 2020 iReady mid-year benchmark indicated that 59% of our students were on or above grade level.The data from iReady indicates that students struggle with vocabulary and nonfiction text comprehension, across grades 3-5.

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

Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) show the greatest decline in ELA. On the 2019 FSA, 32% of the SWD scored at the proficient level, in comparison to 42% of the total population. On the 2020 Winter STAR, 28%of the SWD scored at the proficiency level. On the 2020 iReady Winter diagnostic, only 11% of SWD were on grade level. While the needs of Students with Disabilities are varied, the iReady data indicate that Vocabulary and Comprehension skills are factors that continue to affect this group of students.

**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**

5th grade students show the greatest gap in Science when compared to the state average, though data from the 2020 District science mid-year data did show an improvement. Students scored 30% on the 2019 FSA Science, as compared to the state score of 53%. On the 2020 District science mid-year, 48% of the students indicated that they were on or above grade level. We have found that our students lack experience in science concepts so this past year we focused on giving the students more time to participate in hands-on science lessons, thus solidifying the concepts.

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

Math proficiency continues to be an area of growth. On FSA from 2018 to 2019, our proficiency scores improved from 33% to 57 %. Our 2020 iReady winter diagnostic scores show that 66% of our students are on or above grade level in math. We attribute this growth to the careful analysis of data to determine students' needs and the targeted support given to our teachers by an academic dean.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Attendance continues to be an area of concern. In 2019, we had 14% of our students whose attendance was below 90%, while in 2020 13% of our students were below 90%. Because of Covid-19, there are some unknowns for the upcoming year so that while we will work to improve our attendance, we will also need to be prepared to interact with students virtually to ensure they master the grade level standards.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. ELA learning gains
3. SWD proficiency

4.Science proficiency
5. Math proficiency

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | ELA instruction will be an Area of Focus. Data indicate that though students demonstrated improvement in ELA proficiency and learning gains from 2018 to 2019, there is still a large gap between ELA and Math. In 2019, 41% of students were proficient in ELA compared to 57% in Math. 48% of the students showed learning gains in ELA compared to 66% in Math. The 2020 iReady data indicated that 59% of students were on grade level in Reading and that 66% of students were on grade level in Math.. Students scored 59% on grade level in ELA and 51% on grade level in Math, Using this data, we see a need to continue to focus and strengthen our instructional practices to improve ELA proficiency and to increase student learning gains. |
|---|---|
| **Measureable Outcome:** | 45% of students in grades 3-5 will score at the proficient level in ELA on the 2021 FSA.<br>57% of students in grade 5 will make learning gains in ELA on the 2021 FSA.<br>57% of the lowest quartile students in grade 5 will make learning gains in ELA on the 2021 FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jasmine Smith (smithj3@leonschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will implement standards-based instruction during the ELA block and will utilize differentiated instructional strategies in the classroom during small group instruction. While teachers will focus on all ELA standards, data indicate that an emphasis on comprehension and vocabulary instruction is needed. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | According to the Florida Department of Education's Florida Standards Implementation Guide-English Language Arts, the Florida English Language Arts Standards "are designed around coherent progressions form grade to grade." Planning instruction using the English Language Arts Standards will ensure students are able to build understanding based on foundations from previous years.<br>According to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, differentiated instruction will allow the teacher to accommodate the full diversity of academic needs in a classroom. In order for teachers to ensure students make academic gains these strategies must be implemented daily. According to the National Reading Panel, reading instruction should address the domains of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Our data indicate that vocabulary and reading comprehension are domains of concern for many of our students, therefore a needed focus during instruction. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|

Utilize reading coach to oversee small group instruction within the classrooms.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Utilize reading coach to observe teachers and model research-based strategies.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Regularly review progress monitoring data to modify groups based on student need

| **Person Responsible** | Jasmine Smith (smithj3@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Utilize weekly structured planning time for teacher teams to plan standards-based lessons with an emphasis on vocabulary and comprehension strategies.

| **Person Responsible** | Baleasa Hill (hillb2@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

### #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Instruction for our Students with Disabilities (SWD) will be an Area of Focus. 21% of our students are identified as Students with Disabilities, and various data points indicate that the number of students in this group scoring proficient in ELA is declining. In addition, the group has fallen below the Federal percent of points index of 41% for two years in a row. |
|---|---|
| **Measureable Outcome:** | The Students with Disabilities subgroup will score at least 41% on the Federal percent of points index. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Students with disabilities will receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 targeted interventions, based on on-going data reviews. Students will receive differentiated support from both the classroom teacher and the ESE teachers, either in small groups or individually. Teachers will utilize research-based supplemental resources to provide targeted and intensive interventions based on student needs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Research shows that, "compared with the general student population, students with mild or severe learning disabilities received more benefits from differentiated and intensive support, especially when the differentiation was delivered in small groups or with targeted instruction (McQuarrie, McRae, & Stack-Cutler, 2008). Using this information, our SWD will receive differentiated instruction using Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the classroom with their regular classroom teacher and in the classroom or resource room with their ESE teacher. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Identify students in SWD sub-group and gather baseline data.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Meet with ESE teachers to determine students needs and to create small resource groups.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Meet with subject-area teachers to discuss SWD needs and classroom resources.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Gather bi-weekly data on SWD and review student needs with ESE teachers.Make changes as appropriate.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Science instruction will be an Area of Focus. 5th grade students show the greatest gap in Science when compared to the state average,with 30% scoring proficient at the school level and 53% scoring proficient at the state level. Data from the 2020 District science mid-year data did show an improvement with 48% scoring Proficient. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | 46% of 5th grade students will score at the Proficiency level on FCAT Science. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jasmine Smith (smithj3@leonschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | According to the National Science Standards, "Teaching should actively engage students, incorporate cooperative learning, and de-emphasize the rote memorization of facts." The science lessons will include Engagement, Exploration, Explanation,Elaboration, and Evaluation (5E model).<br>In addition, this year we plan to have our lead science teacher model 5E lessons in grades 2-4 to help increase teacher capacity in the lower grades. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | According to Bybee (1997) using the 5E approach allows students to reorganize, elaborate, and change initial concepts through self-reflection and interaction with peers and their environment." This offers our students the opportunity to internalize science concepts as they prepare to use the concepts in problem-solving situations. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Create lessons based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Science Standards.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Incorporate the 5E Learning Cycle during science instruction.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Utilize the district science coach to observe and model lessons for teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Organize meetings between lead science teacher and teachers for grades 2-4 to review grade level standards and to plan model lessons.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

Review data regularly to determine areas of focus.

| **Person Responsible** | Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net) |
|---|---|

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**During the 20/21 school year, our students will be attending the brick and mortar school or the Digital Academy. We will need to continue to work to improve attendance at school, but will also face the challenge of ensuring students in our Digital Academy attend regularly online. The Attendance Committee, consisting of the Assistant Principal, the Dean of Students, the Guidance Counselor, and the Social Worker will meet weekly to review the absences and to assign students to a committee member. The committee members will contact their students/ families to determine what supports will be needed to improve attendance. The student will remain in the committee member's group throughout the year so that the family will have a consistent point of contact.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Oak Ridge works to keep all stakeholders updated on school and community information and reaches out in a variety of ways to gather input. Within the school building, our teachers and staff work together in teams to support each other and work across grade levels in our Leadership Team to share information and make school decisions. The administration team supports and encourages the staff by ensuring their needs are met and by celebrating their accomplishments.
Our School Advisory Committee offers teachers, parents, and community members the avenue for making decisions that will keep the school moving forward in our task of continuous improvement. The committee meets regularly, either in-person or virtually.
The school also plans a variety of activities/meetings to involve parents, families, and community members in positive school experiences such as Literacy Night, Donuts for Dads, Grandparents' Day, Polar Express Night, and FSA Night. Teachers offer a variety of times for parent conferences and communicate regularly through class newsletters, the planning agenda, and emails/phone calls.
We communicate with our stakeholders using several platforms such as Remind, Class Dojo, email, phone calls, our Facebook page, school website, and Instagram. Our goal is to reach the stakeholders so that they are well-informed and that they are able to give input to assist with making school decisions.
To continue to build a positive school culture with our students, we recognize their accomplishments in several ways. As a part of our school-wide Positive Behavior Plan,

students are celebrated on the morning news show. We also also sponsor such events as AR Celebrations, student VIP parties, and semester Awards Ceremonies.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Part V: Budget** |
| **1** | **III.A.** | | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA** | **$0.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0171 - Oak Ridge Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $0.00 |
| | | | | *Notes: Accelerated Reader incentives will be purchased to use each nine weeks to increase independent reading school-wide.* |
| | | | 0171 - Oak Ridge Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $0.00 |
| | | | | *Notes: Afternoon and Spring Break tutoring sessions will be held to increase students' reading achievement levels.* |
| **2** | **III.A.** | | **Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities** | **$0.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 0171 - Oak Ridge Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $0.00 |
| | | | | *Notes: Students will participate in individual intervention sessions using reading materials that focus on specific needs of the ESE student.* |
| **3** | **III.A.** | | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science** | **$0.00** |
| | | | | | | **Total:** | **$0.00** |