

Orange County Public Schools

# Rock Lake Elementary



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

| Table of Contents              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Demographics            | 3  |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 18 |

# Rock Lake Elementary

408 N TAMPA AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

<https://rocklakees.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Melanie Simmons**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (52%)<br>2017-18: F (26%)<br>2016-17: B (57%)<br>2015-16: D (40%)<br>2014-15: D (38%)                         |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://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.

| Table of Contents              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 18 |

## Rock Lake Elementary

408 N TAMPA AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

<https://rocklakees.ocps.net/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 97%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | F       | B       | D       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.**

OCPS Mission

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

OCPS Vision

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

OCPS Goals

Intense focus on student achievement

High-performing, dedicated team

Safe learning and working environment

Efficient operations

Sustained community engagement

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

| Name              | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Atkinson, Linton  | Principal           | Principal - Lead school improvement initiatives and ensure a safe learning environment for all staff and students. Engage community stakeholders and families.<br>Assistant Principal - Assist the principal in leading school improvement initiatives outlined in the SIP. Monitor Minority Achievement Office initiatives.<br>Janet Ludwig (Resource, LEA) - Provide intervention and ensure compliance for all Exceptional Student Education children. Monitor interventions for subgroups (ESOL, ESE)<br>Ronald Williams (Dean) - Enforce district and schoolwide discipline protocols. Monitor behavior interventions.<br>LaJuana Harpe (CRT) - Provide training opportunities for staff, provide instructional coaching, mentor new teachers and ensure testing measurements are fully compliant and followed. Lead MTSS efforts.<br>Michele Thrift (Math and Science Coach) - Conduct the coaching cycle for targeted teachers to improve their instructional delivery in Math and Science. Monitor math interventions.<br>Maritza Lebron (Reading Coach) - Provide coaching in English Language Arts in order to improve teachers' understanding of the standard and improve their instructional delivery. Monitor reading interventions. |
| Ludwig, Janet     | Instructional Coach | ESOL Compliance/Parent Resource   |
| Williams, Ronald  | Dean                |   |
| Frett, Rozene     | Assistant Principal |   |
| Harpe, LaJuana    | Instructional Coach | CRT, MTSS   |
| Thrift, Michelle  | Instructional Coach | STEM, MTSS  |
| Chambers, Shamica | Instructional Coach |   |

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 52          | 71 | 59 | 64 | 42 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 354   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 13          | 17 | 10 | 15 | 4  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 65    |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 2  | 9  | 16 | 0  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 22          | 17 | 3  | 6  | 1  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 32 | 19 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 9           | 9 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

24

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

Tuesday 7/23/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 25          | 22 | 11 | 16 | 6  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 2  | 6  | 10 | 8  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 13          | 15 | 3  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 37 | 55 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 6           | 8 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 25          | 22 | 11 | 16 | 6  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 2  | 6  | 10 | 8  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 13          | 15 | 3  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 37 | 55 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 6           | 8 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 29%    | 57%      | 57%   | 33%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 51%    | 58%      | 58%   | 60%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 54%    | 52%      | 53%   | 64%    | 53%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 49%    | 63%      | 63%   | 49%    | 61%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 75%    | 61%      | 62%   | 70%    | 64%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 72%    | 48%      | 51%   | 64%    | 54%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 32%    | 56%      | 53%   | 57%    | 50%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total    |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |          |
| Number of students enrolled     | 52 (0)                            | 71 (0)  | 59 (0)  | 64 (0)  | 42 (0)  | 66 (0)  | 354 (0)  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 13 (25)                           | 17 (22) | 10 (11) | 15 (16) | 4 (6)   | 6 (2)   | 65 (82)  |
| One or more suspensions         | 3 (3)                             | 2 (2)   | 9 (6)   | 16 (10) | 0 (8)   | 5 (5)   | 35 (34)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 22 (13)                           | 17 (15) | 3 (3)   | 6 (0)   | 1 (1)   | 4 (0)   | 53 (32)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 32 (37) | 19 (55) | 32 (15) | 83 (107) |

### Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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.

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 25%    | 55%      | -30%                       | 58%   | -33%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 15%    | 55%      | -40%                       | 57%   | -42%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 37%    | 57%      | -20%                       | 58%   | -21%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 18%    | 54%      | -36%                       | 56%   | -38%                    |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 19%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 25%    | 54%      | -29%                       | 56%   | -31%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 21%    | 55%      | -34%                       | 55%   | -34%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 52%    | 62%      | -10%                       | 62%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 20%    | 61%      | -41%                       | 62%   | -42%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 32%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 42%    | 63%      | -21%                       | 64%   | -22%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 25%    | 62%      | -37%                       | 62%   | -37%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 17%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 48%    | 57%      | -9%                        | 60%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 33%    | 59%      | -26%                       | 61%   | -28%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 23%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 32%    | 54%      | -22%                       | 53%   | -21%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 23%    | 53%      | -30%                       | 55%   | -32%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 14       |        |             | 29        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 46       | 60     |             | 62        | 90      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 54     | 59          | 48        | 76      | 74           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 28       | 51     | 59          | 50        | 73      | 67           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       |          | 7      | 8           | 7         | 29      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 22       | 26     | 18          | 29        | 31      | 23           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 23       | 29     | 21          | 32        | 35      | 28           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 9        |        |             | 20        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 57     | 58          | 49        | 69      | 62           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 32       | 57     | 60          | 50        | 69      | 55           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 54   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 70   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 432  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 22   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |      |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 66   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        |      |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |

| Native American Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 53  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  |     |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 51  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was English Language Arts (3rd grade - 25% and 5th grade - 25%). Most teachers did not use effective pedagogical practices with fidelity on a consistent basis. Not all teachers were trained to appropriately use the MTSS Framework and Leveled Literacy Intervention to close reading gaps.

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

There was no decline from the previous year. There were improvements in all areas.

**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.**

The data component with the greatest gap overall was English Language Arts (26% lower than the state average). More specifically, the third grade ELA (-33%) and fifth grade ELA (-31%) scores represent the greatest gap. The factors that contributed to the gap was that teachers did not use effective reading strategies consistently. Additionally, the reading intervention plan was not implemented with fidelity.

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

Overall, Math scores showed the greatest improvement from 29% of students proficient in 2018 to 49% of students proficient in 2019. In 2019, students in grade 3 outperformed their 2018 third grade counterparts by 32% in Math. Fifth grade students performed better in Math by 23% in 2019 when compared to their 2018 Math scores. The new action that the school took to achieve these improvements in math was a focus on teaching math using concrete, representational and abstract activities. The use of small groups to teach and re-teach math concepts was also beneficial. During common planning, coaches helped teachers understand math content and effective math strategies.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

An area of concern is the number of students who achieved level 1 (83 of 170 students in grades 3-5) on statewide assessments. Students in grades 3 and 5, in particular, need additional support to improve in ELA and Math. Two other concerns are attendance below 90% and the number of multiple suspensions.

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

1. English Language Arts - 71% of students were not proficient on the FSA ELA assessments in grades 3-5.
2. Reading Intervention - Students will show improvement in ELA with effective Reading intervention
3. Critical Thinking in ELA, Math and Science

4. MTSS Framework to address all students' academic performance, behavior and attendance
5. Collaborative and effective pedagogical practices including Culturally Responsive Teaching

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

##### #1

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Teachers will effectively use the MTSS Framework to increase student achievement.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Students performed lower than the district average in ELA, Science and Math. The greatest disparity is in Science and ELA. Students performed 24% lower than the district average of 56% in Science and 28% lower than the district average of 57% in ELA.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Student achievement in ELA will increase by 11 percentage points to 40%, math will increase by 6 percentage points to 55% and science will increase by 8 percentage points to 40% proficiency.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Professional development to be provided on MTSS Framework, data tracking and progress monitoring subgroup interventions in math, reading and science   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Most teachers are new to teaching or to Rock Lake Elementary and will need to be trained on how to effectively provide and track core instructions and interventions. Rock Lake is performing lower than the district average in Math, ELA and Science. Students performed 28% lower than the district average in Science and 27% lower than the district average in ELA   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide professional development on the MTSS Framework.</li> <li>2. Implement and monitor structure for extra hour of reading instruction and tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.</li> <li>3. Administration will work closely with the School Transformation Office to monitor and analyze multiple sources of ELA, Math and Science student data (i.e. individual student data, sub groups) in order to drive instruction and coaching cycles within the Multiered Tiered System of Supports Framework.</li> <li>4. Continue with the implementation of bi-weekly data meetings to track and monitor student progress in academics, behavior, and attendance.</li> <li>5. Create, maintain, and monitor the effectiveness of structured interventions, which includes a tracking system to consistently collect and analyze data.</li> <li>6. Continue the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) where students are provided with incentives for demonstrating exemplary academics, behavior, and/or citizenship.</li> <li>7. Track data for all subgroups, including Students With Disability and English Speakers of Other Language, and utilize ESE and ESOL strategies to improve student performance</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net)   |

| #2  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Teachers will deliver rigorous standards-based instruction utilizing effective pedagogical and critical thinking strategies.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Based on student achievement data, there is a need to improve teachers' effectiveness in delivering standards-based instruction.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Students will demonstrate mastery of ELA standards resulting in an increase of 11% overall proficiency (29% increased to 40%).  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Provide teachers with professional development with deconstructing standards to align instruction for reading, writing, speaking, listening, language, and foundational skills into daily instructional practices.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | By increasing the rigor of instruction of the standards, proficiency will increase by 11% on the state assessment. The school achievement score is significantly below the district's average. By focusing on understanding standards, teachers will improve on instructional delivery that meets the rigor of the standards. Data from the previous three years of state assessments shows the need for increasing teachers' understanding of the ELA standards.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Facilitate ongoing book study of Common Core Companion: The Standards Decoded, Grades K-5.</li> <li>2. Facilitate weekly common planning with targeted focus on using research based strategies learned from Common Core Companion into teachers' daily instructional practices.</li> <li>3. Facilitate professional development of the instructional framework with a focus on helping students practice and deepen new knowledge.</li> <li>4. Provide coaching with using Marzano high yield strategies within daily instruction for teachers.</li> <li>5. Instructional walks conducted weekly to monitor continuous usage of high yield strategies which allow students to identify and articulate errors in logic or reasoning and identify student evidence that supports revision of knowledge.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net)  |

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

## 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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.**

The school will communicate with parents regularly using School Messenger, website and a bi-monthly newsletter. Parents, families and other community stakeholders will be invited to join PTA, SAC and participate in various school events and initiatives. Stakeholders in the community will be invited to become Partners in Education and volunteers to assist the school in meeting its goals for the school year.

**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.**

Local preschools, Head Start, VPK and local daycares are welcome to visit our campus. A Kindergarten "Round-up" is scheduled every Spring to register students and provide vital information for prospective kindergartners and their parents. Parents are encouraged to bring their students to "Meet the Teacher" during pre-planning week and also participate in Open House. The "transition" from preschool to kindergarten begins with diagnostic evaluations. Students are given Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) to determine readiness for kindergarten skill development. The data is then used to drive the instruction. School volunteers, including members of the Foster Grandparents, assist kindergarten teachers throughout the school year, especially in the beginning of the year. Volunteers provide extra support to students who are experiencing transitional difficulties. Each Spring, fifth grade students transitioning from Rock Lake tour the middle school they will be attending. Focused evaluation of each student's progress is communicated to the middle school in order to place each student in the appropriate courses. Ongoing parental involvement is encouraged to enhance the transition for the outgoing cohort of students.

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

Teachers are implementing the core curriculum with fidelity. Identified students are placed in their intervention group, based on school-wide diagnostic assessment data. As teachers complete the problem solving request forms, the MTSS Coach will forward the information to the Child Study Team (CST) to determine each individual student's needs. Meetings with the teacher and most appropriate CST members are scheduled to determine why the problem exists through data analysis, identifying specific skill area deficits then implement a plan of action. The action plan is implemented and monitored through CST progress monitoring for approximately 4-6 weeks or 3 data points. If success continues to be minimal, teachers will then complete the intervention analysis form to schedule a meeting to assess prior interventions and intensify the help needed to meet the needs of the student.

At the beginning of the school year, Rock Lake Elementary holds its Title I Annual Meeting. We provide opportunities for parents to become more involved in their child's academic progress by holding Report Card Nights each semester as well as parent conferences on an "as needed" basis. We encourage parents to become ADDition volunteers and welcome them into our school family.

At Rock Lake, we supply food to our neediest families: 1) The Love Pantry, supported by the Christian Service Center (food staples and resources to parents); 2) Each Friday, every identified child who has parent permission, will take home a variety of nonperishable food items, purchased largely through Second Harvest Food Bank. We also provide a clothing closet to supply socks, underwear, T-shirts, hats and gloves as well as "gently worn" tops and pants to students in need.

The Foster Grandparents organization is actively participating at Rock Lake Elementary School in grades kindergarten and first. Rock Lake currently has 8 Foster Grandparents.

**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.**

At Rock Lake, an intense focus on science and math has been initiated. It helps our students understand the nuances and complexity of scientific investigations, engineering challenges, content connection videos, claim-evidence-reasoning assessments, and more. In addition, Rock Lake has enhanced its digital focus by integrating new hardware and software. With immediate access to online curriculum programs, students are exposed to increased text and other applications. Students also have the opportunity to participate in the Teach-In Program, where business partners and other community stakeholders present information about their careers and their career path in order to provide the students with a future college and career orientation. Title I funds will be used to purchase resources for struggling students and provide professional development to improve teacher effectiveness. After school planning sessions with academic coaches will be provided to teachers on a weekly basis. The principal, assistant principal and team leaders will lead bi-weekly book studies on Emergent Literacy (K-2) and Common Core Companion Literacy (3-5) using resources bought with Title I funds.

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

Partnerships will be established and maintained with Partners in Education. Members of the community will be invited to speak to students about their careers during the year. Career mentors will be invited to mentor young girls and boys during special mentoring events throughout the year.

## Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

|        |          |  |  |                 |       |             |             |
|--------|----------|--|--|-----------------|-------|-------------|-------------|
| 1      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Teachers will effectively use the MTSS Framework to increase student achievement.  |  |                 |       |             | \$40,000.00 |
|        | Function | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source  | FTE   | 2019-20     |             |
|        | 3374     | 100-Salaries   | 0641 - Rock Lake Elementary  | Title, I Part A | 330.0 | \$40,000.00 |             |
|        |          |  | Notes: Supplementary academic instruction to be provided by tutors |                 |       |             |             |
| 2      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Teachers will deliver rigorous standards-based instruction utilizing effective pedagogical and critical thinking strategies. |  |                 |       |             | \$0.00      |
| Total: |          |  |  |                 |       |             | \$70,000.00 |