

Brevard Public Schools

# OAK PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



## 2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

- SIP Authority ..... 1
- I. School Information ..... 2
  - A. School Mission and Vision ..... 2
  - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring ..... 2
  - C. Demographic Data..... 6
  - D. Early Warning Systems ..... 7
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review ..... 11
  - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison ..... 12
  - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review ..... 13
  - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review ..... 14
  - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 15
  - E. Grade Level Data Review ..... 18
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 19
- IV. Positive Learning Environment ..... 30
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 35
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review ..... 42
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus ..... 43

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on Brevard School Board approved Sept. 9, 2025.

## SIP Authority

---

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

## SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

---

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

## 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 Department 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.

# I. School Information

---

## A. School Mission and Vision

### Provide the school's mission statement

---

At Oak Park Elementary, our mission is to empower every student to reach their full potential through high-quality instruction, meaningful relationships, and a safe, inclusive environment. We are committed to fostering a love of learning, cultivating character, and preparing students to thrive as compassionate, confident, and capable citizens in a diverse and ever-changing world.

### Provide the school's vision statement

---

At Oak Park Elementary, we believe that every moment matters. Guided by our theme — *“If you’re going to be, be here”* — we envision a school where students, staff, and families are fully present, deeply engaged, and committed to growing together. Through purposeful learning, strong relationships, and a culture of belonging, we strive to create a school community where every child is empowered to succeed and every voice is valued.

## B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

### 1. School Leadership Membership

#### School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

#### Leadership Team Member #1

##### Employee's Name

Kelly Rouse

rouse.kelly@brevardschools.org

##### Position Title

Principal

##### Job Duties and Responsibilities

---

- Lead high-quality instruction and use data to support student growth.
- Implement interventions and support programs like UFLI, Lexia, and i-Ready.

- Promote equity and ensure effective use of Title I funds.
- Foster a positive, inclusive school culture with clear behavior expectations.
- Build strong family and community partnerships to support learning.
- Supervise staff, manage operations, and maintain a safe learning environment.
- Communicate a clear vision focused on student success and continuous improvement.

## **Leadership Team Member #2**

### **Employee's Name**

Karen Berkowitz

Berkowitz.karen@brevardschools.org

### **Position Title**

Assistant Principal

### **Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

- Support instructional leadership by coaching teachers and monitoring student progress.
- Help implement intervention programs and ensure fidelity to Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.
- Promote a safe, respectful, and inclusive school culture aligned with school-wide expectations.
- Lead behavior management systems (e.g., PBIS, CHAMPS) and respond to student discipline needs.
- Support family engagement and communication, especially for at-risk students.
- Assist in overseeing Title I compliance, including data collection and documentation.
- Manage daily operations, including schedules, supervision, and staff support.
- Serve as a key member of the leadership team in driving school improvement.

## **Leadership Team Member #3**

### **Employee's Name**

Tonja Mayo

Mayo.Tonja@brevardschools.org

### **Position Title**

Teacher on Assignment

### **Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

The Teacher on Assignment (TOA) supports school-wide academic, behavioral, and operational goals by working alongside administrators, teachers, and support staff. The TOA provides coaching, models best practices, and assists with intervention, data analysis, and student support systems to improve overall student achievement—especially for those in need of additional support.

## Leadership Team Member #4

### Employee's Name

Liana Coulson

Coulson.Liana@brevardschools.org

### Position Title

Literacy Coach

### Job Duties and Responsibilities

---

The Literacy Coach supports improved literacy instruction and student achievement across all grade levels. This role focuses on building teacher capacity through coaching, modeling, and data-driven collaboration, with an emphasis on foundational reading skills, intervention strategies, and alignment to evidence-based practices such as UFLI and structured literacy. The Literacy Coach plays a key role in meeting the literacy goals outlined in the school's Title I plan.

## 2. Stakeholder Involvement

Describe the process for involving stakeholders [including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders] and how their input was used in the SIP development process (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2)).

*Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.*

---

At Oak Park Elementary, we work together with staff, families, and community members to develop our School Improvement Plan (SIP). The School Leadership Team, which includes teachers and administrators, meets regularly to look at student data and decide on goals and next steps. Teachers share ideas during team meetings and staff discussions. Parents and families give feedback through surveys, the School Advisory Council (SAC), and our annual Title I meeting. Community members and partners are also invited to share ideas to help support student success. All of this input helps shape our goals, choose programs, and decide how we use our Title I funds. We believe that when everyone is involved, our school becomes stronger and more successful for students.

## 3. SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the state academic standards, particularly for

those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

---

At Oak Park Elementary, the School Improvement Plan (SIP) is regularly monitored to ensure it effectively supports all students, especially those with the greatest achievement gaps, in meeting state academic standards. The School Leadership Team meets monthly to review student data—including test scores, attendance, and behavior—and assess progress toward our nine-week goals. These shorter-term goals help us track growth and adjust instruction frequently.

Teachers and staff provide ongoing feedback about what strategies are working and where challenges exist. Families and community members also contribute input through meetings and surveys, and the collection of walk through tool.

Based on data and stakeholder feedback, the SIP is revised as needed to improve outcomes. This ongoing process of monitoring, goal-setting, and revision ensures continuous improvement and that every student receives the support they need to succeed.

## C. Demographic Data

|                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>2025-26 STATUS</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)                                                                                                                     | <b>ACTIVE</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)                                                                                                      | <b>ELEMENTARY</b><br><b>PK-6</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)                                                                                                               | <b>K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS</b>                                                                                                                         | <b>YES</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE</b>                                                                                                         | <b>100.0%</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>CHARTER SCHOOL</b>                                                                                                                                        | <b>NO</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>RAISE SCHOOL</b>                                                                                                                                          | <b>YES</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION</b><br>*UPDATED AS OF 1                                                                                                       | <b>N/A</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)</b>                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED</b><br>(SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS)<br>(SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK) | <b>STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)</b><br><b>ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)</b><br><b>BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)</b><br><b>HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)</b><br><b>MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)</b><br><b>WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)</b><br><b>ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)</b> |
| <b>SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY</b><br><i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>                                                       | <b>2024-25: B</b><br><b>2023-24: C</b><br><b>2022-23: C</b><br><b>2021-22: C</b><br><b>2020-21:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                         |

## D. Early Warning Systems

### 1. Grades K-8

#### Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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 |       |
| School Enrollment                                                                                                         | 68          | 67 | 57 | 86 | 65 | 49 | 46 |   |   | 438   |
| Absent 10% or more school days                                                                                            | 20          | 16 | 20 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 14 |   |   | 110   |
| One or more suspensions                                                                                                   | 14          | 9  | 13 | 13 | 18 | 11 | 6  |   |   | 84    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)                                                                             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0  | 1  | 0  |   |   | 5     |
| Course failure in Math                                                                                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 3  | 3  | 0  |   |   | 21    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment                                                                                       | 10          | 12 | 6  | 21 | 18 | 6  | 7  |   |   | 80    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment                                                                                      | 14          | 18 | 20 | 19 | 14 | 9  | 5  |   |   | 99    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | 2           | 13 | 25 | 40 |    |    |    |   |   | 80    |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)          | 2           | 3  | 16 | 40 | 30 |    |    |   |   | 91    |

#### Current Year 2025-26

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| INDICATOR                            | GRADE LEVEL |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 7 | 9 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 5 |   |   | 52    |

**Current Year 2025-26**

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

| INDICATOR                           | GRADE LEVEL |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained students: current year     | 3           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |   |   | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 |   |   | 13    |

**Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| INDICATOR                                                                                                                 | GRADE LEVEL |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|-------|
|                                                                                                                           | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more school days                                                                                            | 19          | 22 | 29 | 17 | 12 | 10 | 22 |   |   | 131   |
| One or more suspensions                                                                                                   | 1           | 10 | 12 | 14 | 10 | 4  | 19 |   |   | 70    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)                                                                             |             |    |    | 7  | 4  | 2  | 1  |   |   | 14    |
| Course failure in Math                                                                                                    |             |    |    | 6  | 6  | 2  |    |   |   | 14    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment                                                                                       | 12          | 33 | 32 |    | 11 | 12 | 32 |   |   | 132   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment                                                                                      | 14          | 26 | 34 |    | 11 | 14 | 35 |   |   | 134   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | 16          | 27 | 21 | 42 |    |    |    |   |   | 106   |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)          | 4           | 6  | 25 | 36 | 28 |    |    |   |   | 99    |

**Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| INDICATOR                            | GRADE LEVEL |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 9           | 18 | 20 | 22 | 14 | 12 | 27 |   |   | 122   |

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

| INDICATOR                           | GRADE LEVEL |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained students: current year     | 1           | 2 | 2 | 8 | 3 |   |   |   |   | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times |             |   |   | 2 | 1 |   |   |   |   | 3     |

## 2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

## **II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))**

## A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

The district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT                                         | 2025   |           |        | 2024   |           |        | 2023** |           |        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                                                                  | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† |
| ELA Achievement*                                                 | 50     | 62        | 59     | 41     | 61        | 57     | 41     | 58        | 53     |
| Grade 3 ELA Achievement                                          | 50     | 58        | 59     | 34     | 59        | 58     | 37     | 57        | 53     |
| ELA Learning Gains                                               | 58     | 62        | 60     | 56     | 64        | 60     |        |           |        |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile                                       | 63     | 57        | 56     | 55     | 60        | 57     |        |           |        |
| Math Achievement*                                                | 55     | 63        | 64     | 39     | 62        | 62     | 33     | 58        | 59     |
| Math Learning Gains                                              | 69     | 67        | 63     | 68     | 68        | 62     |        |           |        |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile                                      | 62     | 54        | 51     | 74     | 59        | 52     |        |           |        |
| Science Achievement                                              | 48     | 62        | 58     | 57     | 60        | 57     | 29     | 58        | 54     |
| Social Studies Achievement*                                      |        |           | 92     |        |           |        |        |           |        |
| Graduation Rate                                                  |        |           |        |        |           |        |        |           |        |
| Middle School Acceleration                                       |        |           |        |        |           |        |        |           |        |
| College and Career Acceleration                                  |        |           |        |        |           |        |        |           |        |
| Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) | 91     | 62        | 63     | 50     | 57        | 61     | 25     | 54        | 59     |

\*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPi) than in school grades calculation.

\*\*Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

## B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2024-25 ESSA FPPI                            |     |
|----------------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)             | N/A |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students                  | 61% |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students        | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI             | 546 |
| Total Components for the FPPI                | 9   |
| Percent Tested                               | 97% |
| Graduation Rate                              |     |

| ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY |         |         |         |           |          |         |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|
| 2024-25                   | 2023-24 | 2022-23 | 2021-22 | 2020-21** | 2019-20* | 2018-19 |
| 61%                       | 53%     | 36%     | 40%     | 33%       |          | 49%     |

\* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

\*\* Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY  |                                 |                    |                                                       |                                                       |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| ESSA SUBGROUP                       | FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX | SUBGROUP BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32% |
| Students With Disabilities          | 55%                             | No                 |                                                       |                                                       |
| English Language Learners           | 54%                             | No                 |                                                       |                                                       |
| Black/African American Students     | 47%                             | No                 |                                                       |                                                       |
| Hispanic Students                   | 66%                             | No                 |                                                       |                                                       |
| Multiracial Students                | 62%                             | No                 |                                                       |                                                       |
| White Students                      | 63%                             | No                 |                                                       |                                                       |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51%                             | No                 |                                                       |                                                       |

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

| 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|------------------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|
|                                                | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | GRAD RATE 2023-24 | C&C ACCEL 2023-24 | ELP PROGRESS |
| All Students                                   | 50%      | 50%              | 58%    | 63%         | 55%       | 69%     | 62%          | 48%      |         |           |                   |                   | 91%          |
| Students With Disabilities                     | 46%      | 47%              | 69%    | 67%         | 50%       | 62%     |              | 42%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| English Language Learners                      | 30%      |                  |        |             | 40%       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   | 91%          |
| Black/African American Students                | 43%      | 53%              | 59%    |             | 32%       | 57%     | 40%          |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Hispanic Students                              | 46%      |                  | 80%    |             | 46%       | 93%     |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Multiracial Students                           | 53%      |                  | 50%    |             | 63%       | 80%     |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| White Students                                 | 54%      | 58%              | 56%    | 71%         | 64%       | 69%     | 67%          | 62%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students            | 43%      | 46%              | 55%    | 61%         | 48%       | 65%     | 54%          | 39%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |

| 2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |                        |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |                         |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|-------------------------|
|                                                | ELA<br>ACH. | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | MATH<br>ACH. | MATH<br>LG | MATH<br>LG<br>L25% | SCI<br>ACH. | SS<br>ACH. | MS<br>ACCEL.            |
|                                                |             |                        |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2022-23 |
|                                                |             |                        |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>2022-23 |
|                                                |             |                        |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            | ELP<br>PROGRESS         |
| All Students                                   | 41%         | 34%                    | 56%       | 55%               | 39%          | 68%        | 74%                | 57%         |            | 50%                     |
| Students With Disabilities                     | 19%         | 25%                    | 43%       | 48%               | 13%          | 77%        | 73%                |             |            |                         |
| English Language Learners                      | 10%         |                        | 30%       |                   | 0%           | 60%        |                    |             |            | 50%                     |
| Black/African American Students                | 31%         | 29%                    | 66%       |                   | 18%          | 66%        |                    |             |            |                         |
| Hispanic Students                              | 17%         |                        | 33%       |                   | 30%          | 67%        |                    |             |            | 45%                     |
| Multiracial Students                           | 29%         |                        | 43%       |                   | 12%          | 57%        |                    |             |            |                         |
| White Students                                 | 50%         | 38%                    | 61%       | 63%               | 54%          | 73%        | 71%                | 71%         |            |                         |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students            | 41%         | 37%                    | 59%       | 56%               | 39%          | 71%        | 83%                | 47%         |            |                         |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|------------------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|
|                                                | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | GRAD RATE 2021-22 | C&C ACCEL 2021-22 | ELP PROGRESS |
| All Students                                   | 41%      | 37%              |        |             | 33%       |         |              | 29%      |         |           |                   |                   | 25%          |
| Students With Disabilities                     | 21%      | 28%              |        |             | 21%       |         |              | 10%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| English Language Learners                      | 18%      |                  |        |             | 18%       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   | 38%          |
| Black/African American Students                | 29%      | 8%               |        |             | 17%       |         |              | 13%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Hispanic Students                              | 45%      |                  |        |             | 41%       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   | 42%          |
| Multiracial Students                           | 42%      |                  |        |             | 28%       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| White Students                                 | 45%      | 42%              |        |             | 39%       |         |              | 42%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students            | 40%      | 42%              |        |             | 32%       |         |              | 32%      |         |           |                   |                   | 40%          |

## E. Grade Level Data Review – State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested or all tested students scoring the same.

| 2024-25 SPRING |       |        |          |                   |       |                |
|----------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------------|-------|----------------|
| SUBJECT        | GRADE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | SCHOOL - DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL - STATE |
| ELA            | 3     | 47%    | 58%      | -11%              | 57%   | -10%           |
| ELA            | 4     | 41%    | 58%      | -17%              | 56%   | -15%           |
| ELA            | 5     | 50%    | 60%      | -10%              | 56%   | -6%            |
| ELA            | 6     | 57%    | 70%      | -13%              | 60%   | -3%            |
| Math           | 3     | 50%    | 59%      | -9%               | 63%   | -13%           |
| Math           | 4     | 49%    | 60%      | -11%              | 62%   | -13%           |
| Math           | 5     | 45%    | 57%      | -12%              | 57%   | -12%           |
| Math           | 6     | 64%    | 72%      | -8%               | 60%   | 4%             |
| Science        | 5     | 45%    | 60%      | -15%              | 55%   | -10%           |

### III. Planning for Improvement

---

#### A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

##### Most Improvement

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

---

At Oak Park Elementary, both 3rd grade ELA and Math achievement showed significant improvement. ELA proficiency increased from 34% to 50%, and Math proficiency rose from 39% to 55%.

The greatest improvement was in **Math**, with a 16 percentage point increase.

To support this growth, our school took new actions including:

- The Teacher on Assignment (TOA) became the Math Coach and worked closely with teachers to plan and support weekly lessons.
- We used a variety of staff members to provide small group instruction and targeted math interventions.
- Instruction was guided by data, with regular progress monitoring to ensure students were making gains.
- Teachers participated in professional development focused on effective math strategies and differentiation.

These strategies strengthened instruction and helped improve student achievement in math.

##### Lowest Performance

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

---

At Oak Park Elementary, **Science** showed the lowest performance, with proficiency decreasing from 58% to 47%.

Several factors contributed to this decline:

- Limited instructional time dedicated to science due to a strong focus on ELA and Math interventions.
- Reduced hands-on science activities and experiments because of scheduling constraints and resource limitations.
- Challenges in fully integrating science standards into daily lessons, leading to less student engagement and understanding.

A trend observed is that while core subjects like ELA and Math received intensified support, science instruction received less attention, which impacted overall student proficiency.

### Greatest Decline

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

---

At Oak Park Elementary, the greatest decline was seen in the **Lowest 25% Learning Gains in Math**, which dropped from 74% proficiency to 63%.

This decline was influenced by several factors:

- Some students in the lowest 25% did make progress but not enough to be counted as a learning gain.
- Many of these students faced ongoing challenges with foundational math skills, requiring more targeted interventions.
- Limited intervention time and inconsistent implementation of math support programs affected overall progress.
- Staffing changes and the need for additional coaching delayed consistent support for struggling learners.

### Greatest Gap

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.

---

At Oak Park Elementary, **Science** had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our proficiency rate is 48%, while the state average is 58%, showing a 10 percentage point difference.

Factors contributing to this gap include:

- Limited instructional time devoted to science due to prioritizing ELA and Math interventions.
- Insufficient hands-on science activities and resources, which are critical for student engagement and understanding.
- Challenges integrating science standards consistently across grade levels.

The trend suggests that while efforts to improve core subjects have been strong, science instruction requires increased focus and support to close the gap with the state average.

### EWS Areas of Concern

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

---

Based on the EWS data, two key areas of concern at Oak Park Elementary are discipline and attendance.

- Discipline: While behavior incidents have decreased, this remains an area that requires continued support to maintain positive school climate and minimize disruptions to learning.
- Attendance: Chronic absenteeism continues to affect student achievement and engagement. Improving attendance is essential to ensure students are present and ready to learn every day.

Focusing on these areas will be important for supporting student success and a positive learning environment.

### **Highest Priorities**

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

---

#### **Top 5 School Improvement Priorities**

1. Increase science proficiency across all grade levels.
2. Boost ELA and Math proficiency for all students.
3. Improve student attendance to support consistent learning.
4. Reduce disciplinary incidents and promote positive behavior.
5. Continue to raise achievement for all student subgroups.

## B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

### Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

#### Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

---

**Area of Focus:** Mathematics Proficiency

**Grade Levels:** 3rd–6th Grade

#### Description:

Oak Park Elementary will focus on increasing math proficiency in grades 3 through 6. Math instruction will target foundational skills, problem-solving, and conceptual understanding through small-group instruction, data-driven planning, and coaching support. Strengthening students' math skills is essential to their ability to access more complex grade-level content and succeed across subject areas.

#### Rationale:

The overall school math proficiency increased from 39% to 55%, showing significant growth. However, this still falls below the state average of 64%, and several grade levels remain under 50% proficiency. These results highlight the need for continued focus on targeted math interventions, consistent small-group instruction, and coaching support to build teacher capacity. Improving math outcomes will directly support student success on state assessments and help close the achievement gap.

#### Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

---

**Area of Focus:** Mathematics Proficiency

**Grade Levels:** 3rd–6th Grade

#### Prior Year Data (2023–2024):

- 3rd Grade: 50% proficient
- 4th Grade: 49% proficient
- 5th Grade: 46% proficient
- 6th Grade: 64% proficient

- Overall Math Proficiency: 55%
- State Average: 64%

### **Measurable Outcome (2024–2025):**

Oak Park Elementary will increase math proficiency across grades 3–6 with the following goals:

- 3rd Grade: Increase from 50% to 60% proficient
- 4th Grade: Increase from 49% to 60% proficient
- 5th Grade: Increase from 46% to 60% proficient
- 6th Grade: Increase from 64% to 68% proficient
- Overall Math Proficiency: Increase from 55% to 60%, narrowing the gap with the state average

These goals are based on current trends, past performance, and the support systems being put in place to strengthen math instruction, including coaching, intervention, and small-group supports.

### **Monitoring**

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

---

#### **Area of Focus: Mathematics Proficiency**

To ensure progress toward our math proficiency goals, Oak Park Elementary will closely monitor both the **implementation** of instructional practices and the **impact** on student achievement.

#### **Monitoring for Implementation:**

- **Facilitated lesson planning** led by the Math Coach (TOA) to ensure alignment to the depth of the standards
- Weekly classroom walkthroughs and targeted feedback from administration focused on math instruction and student engagement
- Regular fidelity checks of **intense intervention** groups led by the intervention team (T) to support students in the lowest 25%
- Monitoring of small-group instruction schedules and teacher implementation of intervention plans

#### **Monitoring for Impact:**

- Ongoing analysis of formative and summative assessment data, including i-Ready, common assessments, and district benchmarks
- **Tracking student progress to the depth of the standards** during PLCs and data chats every 4.5 and 9 weeks
- Progress monitoring for students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 math interventions
- Adjustments to instruction and grouping based on data-driven decisions made by teachers and instructional leaders

This focused and consistent monitoring will help ensure all students receive the support needed to meet or exceed math proficiency expectations.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Kelly Rouse

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

Evidence-Based Intervention: i-Ready Math (Instruction and Toolbox) Description: i-Ready Math is a blended learning program designed to provide personalized instruction tailored to individual student needs. It combines teacher-led instruction with adaptive, standards-based online lessons. Purpose: This tool supports both core instruction and targeted interventions. It helps teachers identify skill gaps, monitor progress in real time, and adjust instruction based on data. Implementation: Used school-wide in grades 3–6 Integrated into daily math blocks and intervention time Students receive personalized lessons and practice based on diagnostic data Teachers use the Toolbox to plan small-group instruction aligned to the depth of standards Monitoring: i-Ready diagnostic assessments (3x/year) and progress monitoring Weekly review of student usage and lesson pass rates Data chats to adjust instruction and groupings Lesson plan checks to ensure integration into core and intervention blocks

**Rationale:**

Oak Park Elementary selected i-Ready Math as an intervention because it provides personalized, standards-aligned instruction that adapts to each student's level of understanding. The program identifies specific skill gaps through diagnostic assessments and delivers targeted lessons to close those gaps, which is especially critical in a Title I setting where learning levels vary widely. Based on prior year data, math proficiency increased from 39% to 55%, demonstrating growth; however, proficiency still lags behind the state average of 64%. To accelerate progress and ensure consistent, data-informed instruction across all classrooms, i-Ready was chosen for its strong research base, user-friendly progress monitoring tools, and ability to support both Tier 1 and intervention needs. By combining personalized learning with teacher-led small group instruction, i-Ready helps ensure that all students—including those in the lowest quartile—have access to high-quality, targeted instruction that moves them closer to grade-level proficiency.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**

Facilitate Weekly Collaborative Lesson Planning

**Person Monitoring:**

Tonya Mayo

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Description: The Math Coach (Teacher on Assignment) will lead weekly planning sessions with grade-level teams to ensure Tier 1 instruction is aligned to state standards using the Reveal Math curriculum, supported by data from i-Ready.

### **Action Step #2**

Implement Targeted Small-Group Instruction Using i-Ready Toolbox and Reveal Math Resources

**Person Monitoring:**

Tonja Mayo

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers and intervention staff (T) will provide targeted small-group instruction to address specific student needs, using both i-Ready Toolbox and supplemental Reveal Math materials aligned to the standards.

### **Action Step #3**

Monitor Student Progress and Instructional Fidelity

**Person Monitoring:**

Kelly Rouse

**By When/Frequency:**

Monthly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Administration and the Math Coach will regularly review student data from i-Ready and formative assessments, conduct classroom walkthroughs, and provide feedback to ensure effective Tier 1 instruction and interventions.

## **Area of Focus #2**

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

### **Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

**Area of Focus:** English Language Arts (ELA) Proficiency

**Grade Levels:** 3rd–6th Grade

#### **Description:**

Oak Park Elementary will focus on improving ELA proficiency in grades 3 through 6 by strengthening foundational literacy skills, including phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Instruction will be delivered through evidence-based programs and targeted interventions designed to support diverse learners and close achievement gaps. Building strong literacy skills is essential for students' success across all academic areas.

#### **Rationale:**

Prior year data indicates that ELA proficiency levels are below expectations:

- 3rd Grade: **50%** proficient

- 4th Grade: **42%** proficient
- 5th Grade: **51%** proficient
- 6th Grade: **58%** proficient

These results highlight a crucial need for focused literacy instruction, particularly in 4th grade where proficiency is lowest. This data demonstrates gaps in foundational reading and comprehension skills that impact students' academic progress. Targeted support is necessary to increase proficiency rates and ensure students meet state ELA standards.

### **Measurable Outcome**

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

---

**Area of Focus:** English Language Arts (ELA) Proficiency

**Grade Levels:** 3rd–6th Grade

**Overall Proficiency:** Increase from 50% to **57%**, narrowing the gap with the state average

These goals focus on accelerating growth to close the achievement gap through targeted literacy instruction and data-driven interventions.

### **Monitoring**

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

---

To ensure progress toward our ELA proficiency goals, Oak Park Elementary will monitor both the implementation of literacy instruction and the impact on student achievement regularly.

#### **Monitoring for Implementation:**

- Weekly collaborative lesson planning facilitated by the Literacy Coach (T) to ensure alignment with state standards and use of evidence-based practices
- Classroom observations and walkthroughs by administration and the Literacy Coach (T) focused on instructional fidelity and student engagement
- Regular review of intervention schedules to confirm targeted support is delivered with fidelity

#### **Monitoring for Impact:**

- Analysis of formative and summative assessments, including benchmark literacy assessments and progress monitoring tools such as Lexia (T) and i-Ready
- Data review during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) every 4.5 and 9 weeks to evaluate student growth and adjust instruction
- Focused progress monitoring for students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 literacy interventions
- Use of student work samples and reading fluency checks to assess skill development

This ongoing monitoring will allow the school to make timely adjustments and ensure all students are supported in reaching ELA proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Kelly Rouse

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

Lexia Core5 and PowerUp (T): Personalized, technology-based literacy programs that provide targeted instruction in phonics, decoding, and comprehension tailored to student needs.

**Rationale:**

Oak Park Elementary selected these literacy interventions because they are research-based and proven effective in improving foundational reading and language skills critical for student success. Programs like Lexia (T) and UFLI (T) provide explicit, systematic, and multisensory instruction that addresses diverse learning needs, including those of struggling readers and English language learners. Prior year data showed ELA proficiency rates ranging from 42% to 58% across grades 3–6, with an overall proficiency of 50%, which is below the state average of 59%. This indicates a pressing need for targeted, high-quality instruction to close gaps and accelerate student growth. By implementing these interventions with fidelity and monitoring student progress closely, Oak Park aims to build stronger literacy skills, increase proficiency, and ensure all students meet grade-level standards.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**

Facilitate Weekly Collaborative Planning and Data Review

**Person Monitoring:**

Liana Coulson

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

The Literacy Coach (T) will lead weekly grade-level team meetings to plan standards-aligned lessons and analyze student data to inform instruction.

**Action Step #2**

Deliver Targeted Small-Group and Individualized Interventions

**Person Monitoring:**

Liana Coulson

**By When/Frequency:**

Monthly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Classroom teachers and interventionists (T) will provide focused literacy instruction using Lexia (T), UFLI (T), and other evidence-based strategies tailored to student needs.

### **Action Step #3**

Monitor Instructional Fidelity and Student Progress

**Person Monitoring:**

Kelly Rouse

**By When/Frequency:**

Monthly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Administration and the Literacy Coach (T) will conduct regular walkthroughs, review progress monitoring data, and provide feedback to ensure effective implementation of interventions.

### **Area of Focus #3**

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

### **Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

---

#### **Description:**

Oak Park Elementary will focus on improving 5th grade science proficiency by enhancing instruction through hands-on experiments, inquiry-based learning, and close alignment to state science standards. Strengthening science instruction at this grade level is vital for developing students' critical thinking and understanding of key scientific concepts that form the foundation for future learning.

#### **Rationale:**

Data from the prior year shows a decline in 5th grade science proficiency from **57% to 48%**, indicating a significant need to improve instructional practices and student engagement in science. This drop highlights that students may not be receiving enough meaningful, standards-aligned science instruction or opportunities to apply their knowledge.

Focusing on improving science instruction in 5th grade is essential to reverse this decline, close achievement gaps, and ensure students meet state expectations.

#### **Measurable Outcome**

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

---

**Area of Focus:** Science Proficiency

**Grade Level:** 5th Grade

**Prior Year Data (2023–2024):**

- Science proficiency: **48%** proficient (down from 57% the previous year)
- **State Average:** 58% proficient

**Measurable Outcome (2024–2025):**

Oak Park Elementary aims to increase 5th grade science proficiency from **48% to 60%**, narrowing the gap with the state average of 58%, by the end of the 2024–2025 school year.

This target reflects the school's commitment to improving science instruction and student outcomes through focused interventions and enhanced learning experiences.

**Monitoring**

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

---

**Area of Focus:** 5th Grade Science Proficiency

To ensure progress toward the science proficiency goal, Oak Park Elementary will monitor both the **implementation** of instructional strategies and the **impact** on student learning regularly.

**Monitoring for Implementation:**

- Classroom observations and walkthroughs conducted by administration and instructional coaches focused on hands-on, inquiry-based science instruction aligned with state standards
- Weekly hands-on science lessons in the STEM lab for all grades K–6, targeting the standards assessed on state assessments
- Weekly collaborative planning sessions between grade-level teams and the Assistant Principal to align science instruction with state standards and STEM lab activities
- Review of lesson plans and instructional materials to ensure alignment with science standards and incorporation of interactive activities
- Professional development participation logs to verify teacher training in effective science instruction methods

**Monitoring for Impact:**

- Analysis of formative and summative assessments, including district science benchmarks and state standardized test data
- Regular progress monitoring through performance tasks, student work samples, and quizzes related to science concepts
- Data reviews during grade-level PLC meetings every 4.5 and 9 weeks to assess student progress and inform instructional adjustments
- Use of student feedback and engagement surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices

This comprehensive monitoring approach will help ensure that hands-on and standards-aligned science instruction is effectively implemented, supporting progress toward proficiency goals.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Karen Berkowitz

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

**Rationale:**

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**

Implement Weekly Hands-On Science Lessons in the STEM Lab and Classrooms

**Person Monitoring:**

Karen Berkowitz

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Deliver hands-on (T), inquiry-based science instruction aligned with state standards and targeted to assessed standards during weekly STEM lab sessions and within classrooms for grades K–6.

**Action Step #2**

Facilitate Weekly Science Instruction Planning Meetings

**Person Monitoring:**

Karen Berkowitz

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

The Assistant Principal will lead weekly collaborative planning sessions with grade-level teams to ensure alignment of science instruction and STEM lab activities with state standards.

**Action Step #3**

Monitor Instructional Fidelity and Student Progress

**Person Monitoring:**

Kelly Rouse

**By When/Frequency:**

Monthly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Administration and instructional coaches will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs, review lesson plans, and analyze assessment data to ensure effective science instruction and monitor student growth.

## IV. Positive Learning Environment

---

### Area of Focus #1

## Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

---

**Area of Focus: Reducing Behavior-Related Suspensions (Grades K–6)****Description:**

Oak Park Elementary will focus on reducing the number of students receiving out-of-school suspensions due to behavior incidents. Frequent suspensions disrupt students' learning, hinder academic progress, and can negatively impact school culture. This area of focus aligns with the school's efforts to build a safe, supportive, and engaging learning environment where all students can thrive.

Improving behavior outcomes requires a shift toward proactive, restorative practices that support emotional regulation, relationship-building, and consistent expectations. By equipping staff with effective classroom management tools, using behavior data to guide intervention, and increasing student support through SEL and counseling, the school aims to decrease exclusionary discipline and increase instructional time for all students.

**Rationale and Prior Year Data:**

Behavior-related suspensions were identified as a critical need based on 2024–2025 school data. The number of students suspended for behavior in each grade level is listed below:

- **Kindergarten:** 14
- **1st Grade:** 9
- **2nd Grade:** 13
- **3rd Grade:** 13
- **4th Grade:** 13
- **5th Grade:** 11
- **6th Grade:** 6

These numbers reflect a pattern of elevated behavior incidents in the primary and intermediate grades, disrupting learning for both the students suspended and their classmates. Reducing suspensions is essential to ensuring equitable access to instruction, improving student-teacher relationships, and fostering a positive school climate.

**Measurable Outcome**

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

---

Oak Park will reduce the number of students suspended for behavior in each grade level by at least **30%** by the end of the school year:

-

**Impact on Student Learning:**

Reducing suspensions increases students' access to instruction, improves peer relationships, and builds stronger classroom communities. Students who remain engaged in the classroom setting benefit from increased academic opportunities, social-emotional development, and structured support systems that lead to better learning outcomes. Additionally, fewer suspensions contribute to a more consistent, safe, and inclusive school culture.

**Monitoring**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

---

**Monitoring and Impact on Student Achievement: Reducing Behavior-Related Suspensions (Ron Clark-Inspired Approach)**
**Monitoring Plan:**

Oak Park Elementary will implement a proactive and data-driven system to monitor progress toward reducing behavior-related suspensions. The following tools and strategies will be used:

- **Weekly Behavior Data Reviews:** Administration and support staff will review referral and suspension data weekly to identify trends by grade level, location, and time of day.
- **House System Tracking:** Using the Ron Clark Academy house system, positive behavior will be celebrated through points, shout-outs, and team incentives. Students earning points for demonstrating leadership, kindness, and responsibility will be spotlighted, reinforcing schoolwide expectations.
- **Tiered Behavior Supports:** Students receiving multiple referrals will be reviewed through MTSS for Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavioral interventions (check-in/check-out, behavior contracts, mentoring).
- **Classroom Support Walkthroughs:** Administrators and coaches will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs to monitor behavior management strategies, classroom climate, and implementation of RCA-style engagement.
- **Monthly Culture & Climate Meetings:** Behavior trends and staff feedback will be reviewed monthly to adjust supports, recognize successes, and ensure consistency across classrooms and grade levels.

**Impact on Student Achievement:**

Ongoing behavior monitoring and the intentional use of positive school culture strategies will:

- **Reduce Lost Instructional Time:** Fewer suspensions mean students spend more time in class learning.
- **Improve Classroom Engagement:** RCA's emphasis on enthusiasm, relationships, and accountability fosters a high-energy, respectful environment where students are excited to learn.
- **Strengthen Social-Emotional Skills:** Recognizing positive behavior and providing supports

helps students build self-regulation, resilience, and teamwork—skills critical to academic success.

- **Support Equity:** By replacing exclusionary discipline with proactive strategies, all students—especially those historically overdisciplined—will have more equitable access to high-quality instruction.

Through the consistent use of data, celebration of positive behaviors, and intentional intervention for students in need, Oak Park will reduce suspensions while transforming school culture in alignment with the Ron Clark Academy model.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Kelly Rouse

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

#### **Description of Intervention #1:**

##### **Rationale:**

##### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

##### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

#### **Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

##### **Action Step #1**

Implement and Sustain the RCA-Inspired House System

##### **Person Monitoring:**

Kelly Rouse

##### **By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

##### **Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Description: Launch and reinforce a house system that promotes school pride, character development, and positive behavior. Use point tracking, team competitions, and recognition to celebrate leadership, responsibility, and respect.

##### **Action Step #2**

Facilitate Ongoing Staff Training on Engagement and Classroom Management

##### **Person Monitoring:**

Kelly Rouse

##### **By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

##### **Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Provide professional development and coaching on Ron Clark strategies including movement, motivation, student ownership, and proactive behavior management. Focus will be placed on consistency and student connection.

**Action Step #3**

Establish Tiered Behavior Intervention Supports Through MTSS

**Person Monitoring:**

Kelly Rouse

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Use behavior data to identify students needing additional support. Provide structured Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions (mentoring, check-in/check-out, behavior plans) and monitor progress in monthly MTSS meetings.

## V. Title I Requirements (optional)

---

### A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

#### Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

---

At Oak Park Elementary, we want to make sure everyone—students, families, staff, and community members—knows about our School Improvement Plan (SIP), and Schoolwide Plan (SWP). Here's how we share this information:

**1. School Website:**

- All plans are posted online on our school website for anyone to view anytime.
- Website link: <https://oakpark.brevardschools.org/>

**2. Family Communication:**

- We send updates and summaries through newsletters, emails, and texts to families.
- Information is shared in different languages to make sure everyone understands.

**3. Meetings and Events:**

- We talk about these plans at parent meetings, school events, and family nights.
- We use easy-to-understand language and provide translators if needed.

**4. Staff Meetings:**

- Teachers and staff review the plans during meetings and get updates regularly.

**5. Community Partners:**

- We share the plans with local businesses and organizations that help our school.
- We hold community events to discuss progress and listen to feedback.

#### Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

---

Oak Park Elementary is dedicated to building strong, positive relationships with parents, families, and community members to support student success and fulfill our mission. We plan to do this by:

- **Regular Communication:** Sharing timely updates about student progress, school events, and resources through newsletters, emails, phone calls, and texts in multiple languages to meet the needs of all families.
- **Family Engagement Events:** Hosting family nights, workshops, and activities that invite parents and community members to participate in their child's learning and the life of the school.
- **Parent Involvement Opportunities:** Encouraging families to join the Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO), School Advisory Council (SAC), and volunteer programs to help shape school decisions and support students.
- **Accessible Support:** Providing a welcoming environment where families can easily connect with teachers, counselors, and administrators to discuss concerns and celebrate successes.
- **Community Partnerships:** Collaborating with local businesses, organizations, and agencies to offer additional resources and support services that meet the diverse needs of our students and families.

Through these efforts, Oak Park Elementary aims to create a caring and inclusive school community where every family feels valued, informed, and involved.

### Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

---

Oak Park Elementary is committed to strengthening our academic program by focusing on our identified Areas of Focus—ELA proficiency, math proficiency, and science achievement. To achieve this, we will:

- **Enhance Instructional Quality:** Provide teachers with ongoing professional development in evidence-based instructional strategies, including the use of Reveal Math, UFLI, and hands-on science activities, ensuring rigorous, standards-aligned lessons across all grades.
- **Increase Learning Time:** Extend learning opportunities through targeted small-group interventions during and beyond the school day, including before- and after-school tutoring and enrichment sessions to support students who need extra help or acceleration.
- **Enriched Curriculum:** Offer accelerated and enriched learning experiences through STEM lab activities, project-based learning, and literacy programs like Lexia that engage students

and deepen understanding.

- **Collaborative Planning:** Facilitate regular collaborative planning among teachers, supported by coaches and administrators, to ensure lessons are well-paced, differentiated, and aligned to state standards.
- **Progress Monitoring:** Use data from formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction and provide timely supports or challenges to meet each student's needs.

By focusing on these strategies, Oak Park aims to increase the quality and amount of instructional time, enrich the curriculum, and accelerate learning so all students can achieve academic success.

### How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

Oak Park Elementary develops this plan in close coordination with a variety of federal, state, and local programs to provide a comprehensive support system for students and families. This includes integrating resources and services from:

- **Federal and State Educational Programs:** Aligning with Title I services, STEP FOURward, career and technical education, and programs addressing schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) or Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI).
- **Health and Nutrition Programs:** Collaborating with school nutrition services to ensure students have access to healthy meals that support learning and well-being.
- **Violence Prevention and Safety Initiatives:** Working with district and community partners to implement programs that promote a safe and supportive school environment.
- **Family and Community Support Services:** Partnering with local housing agencies, adult education providers, and social services to address barriers that impact student attendance, engagement, and success.
- **Early Childhood and Transition Programs:** Coordinating with STEP FOURward and pre-kindergarten programs to ensure smooth transitions and alignment of early learning goals.

By integrating these resources and programs, Oak Park creates a cohesive approach that addresses students' academic, social, and emotional needs, enhancing the effectiveness of our School Improvement Plan.

## B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

### Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

#### Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

---

Oak Park Elementary is committed to supporting the whole child by providing services that develop students' social, emotional, and behavioral skills alongside academic growth. We offer:

- **On-Site School Counselor:** A full-time guidance counselor provides individual and group counseling, character education, and support for social-emotional development.
- **School-Based Mental Health Services:** We partner with district mental health professionals to provide additional support for students experiencing emotional or behavioral challenges.
- **Mentoring Programs:** Staff and community volunteers participate in mentoring relationships that help build confidence, motivation, and positive decision-making.
- **Behavioral Support Systems:** Through a schoolwide Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) framework, we teach and reinforce positive behaviors to create a safe and respectful learning environment.
- **Social-Emotional Learning (SEL):** SEL lessons are embedded in classroom instruction and school routines to strengthen students' skills in self-regulation, empathy, and relationship building.

These supports help ensure that all students develop the confidence, resilience, and interpersonal skills necessary for success both in and out of the classroom.

#### Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

---

Although Oak Park Elementary serves students in grades PK–6, we understand the importance of early exposure to college and career readiness. We lay the foundation by:

- **Embedding Career Awareness in Instruction:** Students learn about a variety of careers throughout the school year as part of classroom discussions, read-alouds, writing prompts, and project-based learning.
- **STEM and Hands-On Learning Experiences:** Through weekly activities in the STEM lab and

classroom-based projects, students develop problem-solving, collaboration, and critical thinking skills that are essential for future academic and workforce success.

- **Promoting Goal Setting and Leadership:** School-wide systems such as the Ron Clark House System and student leadership roles help students practice responsibility, teamwork, and personal growth.

These strategies help students build foundational skills and awareness to prepare them for future educational and career opportunities.

### **Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services**

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

---

Oak Park Elementary implements a **schoolwide tiered model of support** to prevent and address problem behaviors, aligned with the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and coordinated with services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

- **Tier 1 – Schoolwide Prevention:**

All students participate in schoolwide expectations established through the **Ron Clark Academy House System**, which fosters a positive culture, builds relationships, and promotes leadership and responsibility. The House System promotes intrinsic motivation and behavior ownership through recognition, team spirit, and consistent routines. CHAMPS strategies and Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) structures are also in place to teach and reinforce expected behaviors.

- **Tier 2 – Targeted Interventions:**

Students who require additional support receive small-group interventions, such as social skills groups, mentoring from staff members, and daily behavior check-ins/check-outs. These students are closely monitored for progress and receive targeted instruction in behavior regulation and problem-solving.

- **Tier 3 – Intensive Supports:**

Students with significant behavioral needs receive individualized behavior intervention plans (BIPs), functional behavior assessments (FBAs), and access to school-based mental health services. These supports are developed in collaboration with the MTSS team, Exceptional Student Education (ESE) staff, and, when needed, outside agencies.

Oak Park's tiered behavioral supports are regularly monitored using data from discipline referrals, teacher observations, and behavior tracking tools. Interventions are adjusted based on ongoing review and collaboration between general education, ESE, guidance, and administrative staff to ensure early and effective support for all students.

### **Professional Learning and Other Activities**

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

---

Oak Park Elementary is committed to continuous professional growth to improve instruction and increase student achievement. To support this, the school provides ongoing professional development and collaboration opportunities for **teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel**. These include:

- **Standards-Based Planning and Data Analysis:**

Weekly collaborative planning sessions and data meetings are facilitated by instructional coaches and administrators. Teachers use student data from i-Ready, FAST, and other assessments to guide instruction and respond to student needs.

- **Job-Embedded Coaching and Modeling:**

Instructional coaches and teacher leaders provide in-class modeling, co-teaching, and feedback to improve instructional practices, particularly in reading and math.

- **Training on High-Quality Resources:**

Staff receive professional development on using research-based curricula such as Reveal Math, UFLI Foundations, and i-Ready Toolbox with fidelity and intentionality.

- **Recruitment and Retention:**

Oak Park works to retain effective educators by fostering a positive school culture rooted in the **Ron Clark Academy philosophy**, providing leadership opportunities, and offering mentorship for new teachers. High-need subject areas are prioritized in hiring, and professional learning communities are used to build support networks.

- **Paraprofessional Development:**

Paraprofessionals participate in training focused on small-group instruction, behavior management, and supporting Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions effectively.

Together, these professional learning activities strengthen teacher effectiveness, build instructional capacity, and support data-driven teaching across the school.

### **Strategies to Assist Preschool Children**

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

---

Oak Park Elementary supports a smooth and supportive transition from early childhood programs—including **STEP FOURward**, **VE Pre-K**, and **VPK blended classrooms**—into kindergarten through the following strategies:

- **Kindergarten Orientation:**

Families are invited to a spring orientation where they meet teachers, tour classrooms, and

receive readiness resources to help prepare their child for school.

- **Preschool and Kindergarten Collaboration:**

Teachers from VE Pre-K, VPK, and STEP FOURward work with kindergarten teachers to share information about student needs, curriculum expectations, and effective transition practices.

- **Classroom Visits and Familiarization:**

Pre-K students, including those in VE and VPK blended settings, visit kindergarten classrooms to engage in learning activities and get comfortable with the environment and routines.

- **Family Engagement Events:**

The school hosts family events throughout the year to build relationships and provide support around the transition to kindergarten, including registration help and readiness tips.

- **Individualized Transition Planning:**

For students with IEPs or specific needs, staff—including ESE teachers and support personnel—collaborate with families to ensure proper accommodations and services are in place from the start.

These efforts help ensure every child—regardless of ability or background—feels welcomed, supported, and ready for success in kindergarten.

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

n/a

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

|                                                                                        |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. | No |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

| BUDGET            | ACTIVITY | FUNCTION/<br>OBJECT | FUNDING<br>SOURCE | FTE | AMOUNT |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|-----|--------|
| Plan Budget Total |          |                     |                   |     | 0.00   |