Romeo Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

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.

The mission at Romeo Elementary is to support the Marion County Public School system in developing successful citizens. We expect all students to graduate from high school possessing the skills and knowledge necessary to excel in their chosen post secondary path. We will provide all students with the opportunity to achieve their personal best, to build good character, to learn respect for themselves and others, to accept responsibility for their actions, while developing a love of learning as they become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Always Learning

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Balius, Catherine	Principal
White, Kimberly	Assistant Principal
Williams, Susan	Dean
Carsey, Candace	School Counselor
Renfro, Edward	Instructional Coach

Duties

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

Catherine Balius- Principal in charge of setting the school goals, mission, vision and providing the staff with the tools and support they need so that they can serve students. Evaluates staff.
Kimberly White- Assistant Principal in charge of curriculum. Evaluates staff. Facilitates and provides professional development. Facilitates the MTSS process.
Susan Williams- Dean in charge of classroom management, PBIS, character education and Tier 2 and 3 MTSS behavior plans.
Candace Carsey - Guidance Counselor in charge of Attendance, Character Education, Academic and Behavioral MTSS, provides support to families, ESOL, 504, Migrant Services, and Homeless liaison.
Edward Renfro- Contact Area Specialist in the area of Reading. Provide professional development to teachers. Lead weekly collaborative planning with teachers. Provides classroom coaching and data analysis. Facilitates intensive intermediate interventions when needed.

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	10	52	57	56	44	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	12	23	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	54	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171

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	10	10	18	9	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 8/14/2018

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	4	26	31	21	36	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	3	0	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	58	77	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252

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	8	10	19	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	4	26	31	21	36	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	3	0	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	58	77	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252

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	8	10	19	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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?

Learning Gains for the bottom quartile in ELA (37%) and Math (36%).
Data suggests that this is a trend in reading, but not in math.
2017-18 ELA low 25 at 37%, Math low 25 at 36%
2016-17 ELA low 25% at 40%, Math low 25% at 27%
2015-16 ELA low 25% at 58%, Math low 25% at 35%

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA proficiency declined 4 points from the previous year.
2016-17 49%
2017-18 45%

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

3rd and 4th grade ELA show a significant gap when compared to the state average.
ELA 3rd Grade at 42% proficiency (State at 57%)
ELA 4th Grade at 39% proficiency (State at 56%)
ELA 5th Grade at 52% proficiency (State at 55%)

3rd, 4th and 5th grade Math data show a gap when compared to the state average.
Math 3rd Grade at 54% proficiency (State at 62%)
Math 4th Grade at 54% proficiency (State at 62%)
Math 5th Grade at 45% proficiency (State at 61%)

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

5th grade in general made huge improvements in reading and math.

5th Grade ELA

2015 41%
2016 39%
2017 39%
2018 52%

5th Grade Math
2015 41%
2016 41%
2017 33%
2018 45%

Data suggests that this is not a trend.

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

A change in personnel within the grade level accounted for a great deal of improvement in this area, addition of standards aligned curriculum materials, and grade level collaborative planning

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	45%	46%	56%	45%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	44%	55%	53%	49%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	37%	48%	58%	47%	46%
Math Achievement	50%	49%	62%	47%	48%	58%
Math Learning Gains	41%	46%	59%	37%	47%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	35%	47%	35%	40%	46%
Science Achievement	53%	51%	55%	46%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (4)	52 (26)	57 (31)	56 (21)	44 (36)	61 (25)	280 (143)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	4 (0)	3 (2)	2 (2)	4 (4)	2 (4)	15 (15)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	7 (5)	12 (7)	23 (12)	2 (0)	9 (0)	53 (24)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (58)	54 (77)	102 (117)	171 (252)

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	42%	46%	-4%	57%	-15%	
	2017	54%	50%	4%	58%	-4%	
Same Grade Comparison		-12%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	39%	43%	-4%	56%	-17%	
	2017	49%	52%	-3%	56%	-7%	
Same Grade Comparison		-10%					
Cohort Comparison		-15%					
05	2018	52%	46%	6%	55%	-3%	
	2017	39%	47%	-8%	53%	-14%	
Same Grade Comparison		13%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2018	54%	48%	6%	62%	-8%	
	2017	59%	48%	11%	62%	-3%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	43%	47%	-4%	62%	-19%	
	2017	52%	55%	-3%	64%	-12%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison		-16%					
05	2018	45%	50%	-5%	61%	-16%	
	2017	33%	45%	-12%	57%	-24%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		-7%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2018	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%	
	2017						
Cohort Comparison							

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	17	30	35	15	43	44	27				
ELL	21	33	39	37	33	32	17				

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
BLK	33	40		25	20						
HSP	38	48	35	49	39	28	48				
MUL	63			56							
WHT	50	43	38	53	43	42	60				
FRL	41	45	36	47	39	33	48				
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	26	54	63	23	43	29	21				
ELL	21	28	38	38	19	14	6				
BLK	44	50		40	45						
HSP	37	43	38	48	32	13	19				
MUL	60			50							
WHT	59	58	45	52	44	32	54				
FRL	45	49	42	46	39	24	31				

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	Instruction in Reading and Math
Rationale	After reviewing multiple pieces of data and 3-year FSA trends, root cause analysis reveals that a deep understanding of the Florida Standards, use of instructional resources that are not aligned to the Florida Standards and a lack of common formative assessment data used to drive instruction contributed to the problem.
Intended Outcome	If teachers at Romeo Elementary School consistently deliver Florida Standards aligned instruction in reading and math, then student proficiency will increase in the follow grades as measured by F.S.A. data. ELA Grade Baseline Target 3rd 42% 57% 4th 39% 56% 5th 52% 55% Math Grade Baseline Target 3rd 54% 62% 4th 43% 62% 5th 45% 61%
Point Person	Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	The Content Area Specialist will provide classroom coaching, data analysis and professional development to ELA and Math Teachers. Use of standards aligned curriculum (I-Ready) Collaborative Planning and use of common formative assessments to measure effectiveness of instruction and plan remediation. Delivery of coordinated and targeted intervention. Engagement of Parents in student learning.
Person Responsible	Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monthly ELA and Math data analysis to monitor effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction and growth of Tier 2 and 3 students (I-Ready, classroom formative assessments, etc) Classroom walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Learning Gains for students in the low 25%
Rationale	After reviewing multiple pieces of data and 3-year FSA trends, root cause analysis reveals that the lack of consistency and fidelity when providing intervention to students in the low 25% contributed to the problem.
Intended Outcome	If 4th and 5th grade students in the low 25% participate in a systematic immediate intensive reading and math interventions delivered with fidelity and regular data monitoring then Learning Gains as measured by F.S.A. will increase. ELA Low 25% Baseline 37% ELA Low 25% Target 48% Math Low 25% Baseline 36% Math Low 25% Target 47%
Point Person	Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	The Assistant Principal and Content Area Specialist will identify 4th and 5th grade students who are classified as Low 25% in ELA and Math and coordinate a comprehensive ELA and Math intervention plan to fill in the academic gaps of these students. Instructional Staff will participate in professional development as needed on how to implement and monitor the effectiveness of various intervention programs with fidelity.
Person Responsible	Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monthly ELA and Math data analysis by administrative team as well as 3 x's yearly PMP Meetings with teachers and support personnel to monitor the progress of identified Low 25% 4th and 5th grade students. Administration will conduct weekly fidelity checks of all 4th and 5th grade intervention groups. Regular Data Analysis of Formative assessment will be the focus of Collaborative Planning meetings and used to plan remedial classroom instruction.
Person Responsible	Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Romeo prides itself on developing positive relationships with parents. A great deal of effort has gone into developing a school that is welcoming and kind. All parent trainings are designed to facilitate learning not to just sit and get. All teachers use Class Dojo to communicate with parents via messages and pictures.

All Dojo information is translated into the parents native language. All classroom and school newsletters are sent home in English and in Spanish. Parents events occur at times that parents have indicated they are most likely to attend. Translators are available to parents at all after school events as well as throughout the school day if needed. Stakeholders are encouraged to attend school events. Romeo's parents are surveyed throughout the year seeking their input and following through with making suggested changes as needed. Romeo leads the district in the number of volunteer hours served. This is a testament to the positive relationships that have been build and maintained at Romeo.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Individual students are referred to the guidance counselor by school staff, other students, or parents. Students can also make self-referrals. Small group opportunities are available for social skills training and social/emotional learning. The guidance counselor refers students who need ongoing, intensive therapy to outside organizations. Classroom guidance is available for specific topics, eg. friendship, responsibility, etc. We have a monthly school wide character awareness program targeting characteristics such as honesty, kindness, etc. Professional development is provided for staff to assist them in meeting the needs of special populations, eg. students with disabilities, low socioeconomic groups. There is also a school wide crisis intervention plan in place to address sudden, traumatic events.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

A VPK program is based at the school in which all of the students will feed into the regular Kindergarten program. We also have incoming Kindergarten students who have not participated in the Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. These students are encouraged to attend the summer VPK program. Efforts are made in the spring to facilitate early kindergarten registration so that incoming kindergarten students can take advantage of the summer VPK program. Flyers are sent home and the school newsletter encourages early kindergarten registration.
The Stagger Start program will be used at Romeo this year to help students develop close bonds with their new surroundings. For the first 3 days of school the classes will be divided in third so that only one third of the students will be in class. This gives teachers a chance to assess these students, determine strengths and weaknesses, and to build relationships with the students prior to having the whole class in attendance.
Romeo Elementary collaborates with feeder middle schools to provide information about the middle school curriculum to incoming 6th grade students. 5th grade students take a field trip to the middle school where they get an orientation and learn about middle school expectations.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Administrative Team Meetings-Person Responsible: Principal, Held weekly
Collaborative planning- Person Responsible: Content Area Specialist , Held weekly
Progress Monitoring Meetings - Person Responsible: Assistant Principal, held 3 times yearly
Child Study Team Meetings- Person Responsible: Guidance Counselor, held as needed
Child Study Team Meetings (Attendance Issues) Person Responsible: Guidance Counselor & Social Worker , help quarterly and follow up meetings with parents as needed.

To meet the needs of all students and maximize desired outcomes teachers meet regularly with the Assistant Principal of Curriculum to review data and allocate resources to meet classroom needs. Progress Monitoring Meetings examine the effectiveness of Tier I instruction and develop Tier II and III interventions. These meetings occur 3 times per year at a minimum. Funding is also used to provide additional paraprofessionals on campus to work with small groups of students to improve academic achievement. Additionally, Problem-Solving Team meetings are held on an as-needed basis to address needs of specific students and allocate resources based on those needs.

An inventory of resources is maintained by the Assistant Principal using Destiny.
Human resources are managed weekly by the administrative team during weekly meetings, or more often if needed, to meet the immediate needs of students. Formal and informal data is used to determine where to allocate Title 1 resources.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Marion County Public Schools implements standards provided by the state that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade (K-12) and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers and life. Romeo Elementary hosts a yearly Career Day where community members come and share information about their career as well as the education that was needed for them to learn their career.
Students at Romeo have access to technology in order to prepare them for college and career opportunities.
Romeo Elementary also reinforces Career soft skills such as Dependability, Reliability, Communication, Positive Attitude and Team Work through our PBIS program as well as the incorporation of Kagan Cooperative Learning structures in the classroom.
Students at Romeo are developed as Leaders through character education and opportunities. It is our belief that these opportunities will develop successful citizens.

Part V: Budget

Total:	$300,502.00