Round Lake Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Round Lake Elementary School

31333 ROUND LAKE RD, Mount Dora, FL 32757

https://rle.lake.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-7	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	37%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	B	A	B*

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission this year will focus on creating motivated learners. The adult-focused mission is to have 100% of administration and staff motivated to learn by engaging in self-selected book studies throughout the year. The student-centered mission is to build classroom communities that help students to set personal growth goals that they will be motivated to achieve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Round Lake Charter is a compassionate community that strives to create motivated learners by tailoring instruction to meet the needs of all students leading to growth in the classroom and beyond.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Bartberger, Linda	Principal
Roman, Todd	Assistant Principal
Chevalier, Michelle	Other
Harley, Stevie	Assistant Principal
Dean, Nicole	Instructional Coach
Sanders, Leticia	Instructional Coach
Porter, Erin	School Counselor
	Dean

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The members of the School Leadership Team meet weekly to plan, problem-solve, and discuss topics and issues related to instruction, personnel, students, and school culture. The team will also meet monthly to participate in a book study of Innovator's Mindset by George Couros.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	8	5	4	8	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	7	5	5	6	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	17	19	22	32	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	27	29	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	11	41	40	53	63	55	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	295

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	10	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	11	15	16	21	18	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	87

Date this data was collected

Friday 9/7/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	5	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	19	17	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	24	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	5	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	19	17	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	24	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The performance of our lowest quartile in ELA and Math were the lowest components in 2018 and 2017. They are also the District and State's lowest areas of performance.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The only area which showed a decline from the previous year is Science. The difference was a decrease of 2 percentage points.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The largest gap was in ELA Achievement; we outscored the State by 12 percentage points.

The largest gap when the State had a higher score was in Math performance of the Lowest Quartile (3 %points) and Science (2 %points).

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The component with the most improvement was performance of the Lowest Quartile in ELA with a gain of 12%. This is not a trend; the prior year (2016) we showed 65% of students in the Lowest Quartile scoring proficient.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Some of the ways we targeted assistance to those in the Lowest Quartile were: homogeneous grouping (by grade level) for remediation period 4 days a week; iReady instruction 45 minutes per week required at Tier II for MTSS, strongly suggested for all; small group instruction within the reading block targeting specific skills.

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	67%	60%	63%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	53%	57%	63%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	46%	52%	65%	41%	49%
Math Achievement	72%	69%	61%	64%	55%	56%
Math Learning Gains	68%	60%	58%	72%	53%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	51%	52%	61%	45%	48%
Science Achievement	55%	65%	57%	48%	55%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	77%	0%	75%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (0)	8 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	8 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	47 (0)
One or more suspensions	7 (5)	5 (4)	5 (0)	6 (0)	4 (1)	7 (2)	8 (0)	0 (0)	42 (12)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (0)	17 (19)	19 (17)	22 (6)	32 (5)	13 (2)	18 (0)	0 (0)	126 (49)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (13)	27 (24)	29 (18)	7 (0)	0 (0)	80 (55)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	75%	61%	14%	57%	18%
	2017	69%	63%	6%	58%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	72%	59%	13%	56%	16%
	2017	65%	56%	9%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2018	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%
	2017	69%	53%	16%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	77%	47%	30%	52%	25%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		8%				
07	2018					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018	77%	65%	12%	62%	15%
	2017	67%	66%	1%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
	2017	58%	61%	-3%	64%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2018	70%	58%	12%	61%	9%
	2017	68%	54%	14%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2018	77%	49%	28%	52%	25%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2018	55%	54%	1%	55%	0%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	42	43	22	38	28	28				
ELL	56	73	67	51	54	43					
ASN	90			100							
BLK	63	62	46	59	56	56	23				
HSP	64	69	59	64	70	57	42				
MUL	69	44		69	56		40				
WHT	77	65	50	77	71	44	67				
FRL	61	61	56	59	61	43	42				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	39	37	20	39	32	11				
ELL	33	48	53	45	48	27	25				
BLK	57	48	25	48	52	25	31				
HSP	52	58	48	50	54	47	34				
MUL	62	33		57	60						
WHT	77	73	44	74	69	42	71				
FRL	55	57	38	50	58	38	43				

Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Academic: Performance on State Tests
Rationale	Although our scores place us in the School Grade range of an A, there is still room for improvement and growth in our FSA performance. We also compared students' FSA and iReady results with their classroom grades and noticed some discrepancies, especially at the Level 1 and 2 range.
Intended Outcome	Our goal is to reach a 10% increase in achievement and learning gains. ELA Achievement = 79% ELA Learning Gains = 71% Math Achievement = 79% Math Learning Gains = 75% Science Achievement = 61%
Point Person	[no one identified]

Action Step	
Description	Clarify our grading policy re: reteaching and regrading. Ensure our weighting policies at each grade level are in sync with each other and with our school goals. Strengthen our Promotion Plan in order to give students the time they need to develop skills rather than relying on a grade of 60% or higher to be the sole deciding factor. Students who earn less than a 70% will be brought to the attention of a committee (teachers, administration, MTSS Team) who will review those students' grades, assessments, observations, etc. to determine if a parent meeting is needed in order to discuss best placement for each child. Teachers will include spiral review in lessons (remediation period, classroom centers, math and science dailies) and on assessments (review questions on unit and/or weekly tests).
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Review of iReady and LSA results (1-3 times per year) Comparison of grades and iReady/LSA scores through Performance Matters Administrative review of students' grades twice per quarter using a shared data tool (teachers input information, administration follows-up)
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Activity #2	
Title	Academic: Lower Quartile
Rationale	Although we made gains from the previous year in the percentage of Lower Quartile students who scored proficient on the LSA, their results were our lowest. In the case of Math Lowest Quartile, we underscored the State by 3 percentage points.
Intended Outcome	Our goal is to have at least 10% growth in proficiency among our Lowest Quartile. ELA Lowest Quartile = 57% Math Lowest Quartile = 54%
Point Person	[no one identified]
Action Step	
Description	Every 4 1/2 weeks (at progress report and report card times), teachers will input names and grades of students with a D or F in a shared document (Striving Students Spreadsheet). Administration will then review and meet with teachers/grade levels and, when applicable, with individual students. At the middle school level, our ESE inclusion teacher and/or ESE School Specialist will work with ESE and struggling students 2 days per week in Science and 2 days in Social Studies, in addition to their regular time for ELA and Math. Each of our 6th graders and most of our 7th graders have a mentor assigned to them who will be an additional support for those identified as lowest quartile (as well as others). MTSS Team will review iReady and other data, as well as students brought up by teacher recommendation, throughout the year to make sure that those who appear to be struggling have supports and/or interventions in place. Team will monitor their progress throughout the year.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Bi-quarterly meetings with administration/Leadership Team and teachers to identify students in need of support based on Striving Students Spreadsheet Quarterly review of students in the Lowest Quartile's grades, school/district assessment results, mentor check-ins Weekly MTSS meetings
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Activity #3	
Title	Culture
Rationale	Our staff and leadership team developed a new Vision. From this Vision, we selected an area of focus to develop our Current Mission: creating lifelong, motivated learners.
Intended Outcome	100% of our administration and instructional staff will be engaged in book studies on topics selected by the staff members according to their interests and needs.
Point Person	[no one identified]

Action Step	
Description	After selecting the topics/books they would like to study this year, teachers were grouped in PLCs and each given a copy of the book. They created their own reading plan, norms, and list of responsibilities. PLCs will meet monthly to discuss, share, and plan for application of their learning.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Members of the Leadership team will sit in on PLCs (they will meet for their own at a different time) and all PLCs will meet together at the end of the year for a final share out. Time may be taken at faculty meetings throughout the year to share, as well.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$1,500.00**