

Orange County Public Schools

Rosemont 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Rosemont Elementary

4650 POINT LOOK OUT RD, Orlando, FL 32808

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

Demographics

Principal: Cruz Diaz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: D (32%) 2014-15: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Rosemont Elementary

4650 POINT LOOK OUT RD, Orlando, FL 32808

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-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	98%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	D	D	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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
Gibson, Tracey	Principal	Mrs. Gibson, principal of Rosemont Elementary is responsible for the overall functioning of the school and data for all grade levels. Mrs. Gibson attends and facilitates Data/Multi-Tier Support Systems and Profession Learning Community (PLC) meetings. Mrs. Gibson monitors both lesson plans and classroom instruction through observations to ensure standards based instruction and tasks are aligned to the standards. She provides actionable feedback to increase both teacher and student growth. Mrs. Gibson communicates on a consistent manner with the stakeholders of the school be it parents, community members, business partners or county level staff.
Stanton, Merrill	Instructional Coach	In her role of instructional coach, Mrs. Stanton utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in best practices for delivering standard-based instruction. She participates in grade level professional learning communities and provides mentoring and professional development to build teacher capacity. Her focus will be on building capacity of our Kindergarten, first and second grade teachers to ensure maximum growth of the foundational skills and standards needed to be successful in subsequent years.
Foster, Eddie	Assistant Principal	In the role of Assistant Principal, Eddie Foster participates in the ongoing process of progress monitoring of student achievement data. Mr. Foster monitors the effectiveness of classroom instruction and provides actionable feedback to teachers which includes observing, coaching and evaluating. Mr. Foster attends PLC meetings and supports the instructional coaches. He is part of the Threat Assessment team and DCTL team.
Charles, Charline	Assistant Principal	In the role of Assistant Principal, Charline Charles participates in the ongoing process of progress monitoring of student achievement data. She is part of Multi-Tier Support System team working with teachers to identify strategies both academic and behavioral to meet student needs. Ms. Charles monitors the effectiveness of classroom instruction and provides actionable feedback to teachers which includes observing, coaching and evaluating. Ms. Charles attends PLC meetings and supports the instructional coaches.
Walters-Phillips, Barbara	Instructional Coach	In her role of STEM coach, Mrs. Walters-Phillips utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in best practices for delivering standard-based instruction for both math and science. She participates in grade level professional learning communities and provides mentoring and professional development to build teacher capacity. Her focus will be on building capacity of our teachers new and veteran in math and science..
Daddio, Jill	Instructional Media	Mrs. Daddio is the media specialist at Rosemont Elementary. Not only is she responsible for maintaining our school media center, she is part of the DCLT. She is the lead member in ensuring all of our new student computers and iPads are inventoried with the roll out of the One to One Digital process. She is part of Multi-Tier Support System team working with teachers to identify strategies both academic and behavioral to meet student needs.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dodd, Zaneta	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Dodd is the Staffing Specialist at Rosemont Elementary. She is responsible for maintaining accurate reporting and compliance of our Students with Disabilities. She is the liaison with our parents seeking support for students in our ESE programs. She facilitates meeting with parents and district staff as well as working with teachers to provide best practices and instructional strategies to meet our ESE students' needs. She is a member of the Multi-Tier Support team.
Poole, Tawana	Instructional Coach	In her role of reading specialist, Ms. Poole utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in best practices for delivering standard-based instruction. She participates in grade level professional learning communities and provides mentoring and professional development to build teacher capacity in the area of reading.

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	116	105	98	116	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	41	21	23	19	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	23	18	22	28	29	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
Course failure in ELA or Math	23	13	30	34	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	49	37	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

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	17	8	18	35	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	1	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/14/2019

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	27	25	26	31	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	11	13	20	30	37	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	24	63	23	50	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	71	64	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206

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	8	11	30	44	55	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186

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	27	25	26	31	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	11	13	20	30	37	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	24	63	23	50	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	71	64	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206

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	8	11	30	44	55	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186

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	38%	57%	57%	30%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	58%	58%	37%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	53%	40%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	63%	63%	30%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	61%	62%	44%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	48%	51%	37%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	56%	53%	29%	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	116 (0)	105 (0)	98 (0)	116 (0)	100 (0)	100 (0)	635 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	41 (27)	21 (25)	23 (26)	19 (31)	20 (18)	13 (22)	137 (149)
One or more suspensions	23 (11)	18 (13)	22 (20)	28 (30)	29 (37)	34 (22)	154 (133)
Course failure in ELA or Math	23 (18)	13 (24)	30 (63)	34 (23)	17 (50)	22 (22)	139 (200)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	49 (71)	37 (64)	46 (71)	132 (206)

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	35%	55%	-20%	58%	-23%
	2018	33%	55%	-22%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
	2018	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
	2018	21%	55%	-34%	55%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	63%	-9%	64%	-10%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	41%	57%	-16%	60%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	27%	59%	-32%	61%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
	2018	23%	53%	-30%	55%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
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	19	65	60	35	62	69	27				
ELL	35	53		45	72						
BLK	36	54	53	56	66	54	44				
HSP	41	67		66	81						
MUL	46			62							
FRL	36	56	61	57	63	47	41				
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	5	17	24	8	32	35					
ELL	41	58	40	31	45	36	30				
BLK	26	31	33	37	40	32	21				
HSP	30	23		37	41	36	15				
MUL	31			50							
FRL	27	31	35	37	39	33	24				
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		27	33	3	35	36					
ELL	24	47	50	32	62		27				
BLK	28	34	41	28	43	38	25				
HSP	40	45	30	36	45		53				
MUL	25			36							
FRL	23	34	39	26	44	38	28				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
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 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	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	52
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 is ELA proficiency with a score of 38%. Though this was an overall increase of 10% from the prior year score of 28%, Rosemont's ELA score was below the district average of 57%. One contributing factor to the discrepancy in Rosemont Elementary to the district average is attributed to the high student mobility rate. This attributed to critical gaps in student learning within the phonics continuum and the reading process. Student achievement and trend data indicated that student placement in appropriate interventions and remediation was challenging due to the instability of the student population. Another observable trend is student proficiency data indicating that 60% of students were 1 or more years below grade level upon entrance into 3rd grade, according to i-Ready Reading trend data. Trend data also indicates

that student absenteeism and tardiness was a factor with student attendance below 90% totaling 149 students.

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

Rosemont Elementary School did not have any data components decline. Each component showed between 19%-28% growth over the 2018-2019 school year.

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 compared to the state average is ELA proficiency with a school score of 38% and the state average of 57%. Two factors that contributed to the achievement gap were a high rate of student mobility and student absenteeism rate. This impacted student achievement data due to the barriers it created for student learning within the phonics continuum and the reading process. The student attendance data indicated that 149 students had a below 90% attendance rate. Additionally, i-Ready reading data indicated that 60% of students entering 3rd grade at the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year were 1 or more years below grade level.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is ELA Gains, both overall and Lowest 25th percentile. Overall gains rose from 30% to 57% and lowest 25% gains increased from 33% to 61%. Additional support in ELA through the extra hour of daily reading with flexible, fluid grouping throughout the year was a contributing factor. Additionally, coaching and instructional support from The School Transformation Office was introduced this year. Teachers worked collaboratively in planning sessions to analyze student data, created learning targets based on deconstructed Florida State Standards and planned for instructional delivery.

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

Two potential areas of concern from our EWS data are "Attendance below 90%", specifically from our kindergarten students and also "one or more suspensions" from specifically our kindergarten and fourth grade students who will be moving to 1st and 5th grades this year.

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

1. ELA proficiency- 18% Less than District
2. Science proficiency- 15% Less than District
3. Math proficiency- Same score as the District
4. ESE student subgroup- ELA 19% Achievement, but 65% gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Rosemont Elementary School will continue to build teacher capacity in the areas of standards-based instruction and delivery across all content areas.
Rationale	Though Rosemont had increased in each data component for proficiency, we are still below the state and district averages. With the high turnover rate of teachers, Rosemont will have 15 new teachers with various levels of experience be it brand new or new to the state/county. In order to sustain and achieve higher levels of growth, Rosemont teachers need to build their capacity with standards-based instruction and delivery in all content areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA Proficiency will increase by at least 7% to 45% on the Statewide ELA Florida Standards Assessment from the previous year. Target goal-57%</p> <p>Science Proficiency will increase by at least 5% to 50% on the Statewide Science Assessment from the previous year. Target goal-56%</p> <p>Math Proficiency will increase by at least 3% to 60% on the Statewide Math Florida Standards Assessment from the previous year. Target goal-62%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>High Yield Instructional Strategy:</p> <p>*Helping Students Process New Content-Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting "Helping students process new content" is, in order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students and the content. Rosemont has 15 new teachers on staff with varying levels of pedagogy, as well as 10 additional teachers with less than 4 years of experience. A need for researched-based strategies to be continuously in the forefront of planning and delivery of effective instruction is evident.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff Development on the Instructional Framework Overview during Jump-start Summer Planning. Teachers invited to participate in the Canvas Instructional Framework course in a face to face school wide format on July 11, 2019. 2. Staff Development on effective instructional reading strategies with a continued focus on the District-wide strategies of Close Reading, Text Dependent Questioning, Text Complexity, Annotation, and Academic Discourse. July 10, 2019. 3. Once a month Rosemont's Beginning Teacher Program, "Eagle Pack" will meet to enhance teacher pedagogy through information and feedback sessions. The Deliberate Practice Canvas Course will be included in this program to increase knowledge of all High Yield Instructional Strategies. 4. Each grade level along with instructional resource teachers and coaches will be given the opportunity though TSSSA funds to participate in planning and professional learning opportunities beyond their duty day. 5. School-based and School Transformation Coaches will implement the coaching cycle based on teacher need as well as support teachers in weekly common planning to ensure rigorous standards-based lessons are created and implemented.
Person Responsible	Merrill Stanton (merrill.stanton@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Rosemont Elementary School will continue to build teacher capacity in the area of data analysis and data-driven instruction to increase student proficiency and close achievement gaps.
Rationale	Rosemont's Federal Percent of Points Index overall is 55%, which is above the 41% threshold to be considered either in the TS&I or CS&I categories. Every subgroup met the target as indicated by the data that follows; SWD-48%, ELL-52%, Black/African American-53%, Multiracial-54%, Economically Disadvantaged-52%. Rosemont has 15 new teachers for the 2019-2020 school year. In order to sustain our growth and reduce achievement gaps, our teachers must continue to build capacity in data analysis and data driven instruction.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Though our subgroup Students with Disabilities had an Percent of Points Index of 48%, it is still our lowest subgroup according to ESSA. Student ELA proficiency for this subgroup was 19% and learning gains 65%. The measurable outcome for SWD would be to increase proficiency to 50% which will then increase the SWD percent of points index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	High Yield Strategy for ESE *Build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Rosemont has had an increase of students enrolling with IEPs already in place as well as parents requesting either testing of their student or the creation of a "504" plan. After special education teachers develop instructional goals, they evaluate and make ongoing adjustments to students' instructional programs. Classroom teachers need to be a continued part of the process and be able to engage in ongoing data collection and analysis using curriculum-based measures, informal classroom assessments, and observations of student academic and behavioral progress. Discussions and planning with key stakeholders is necessary to improve student learning by making adjustments to teacher instructional practices. "Effective teachers retain, reuse, and extend practices that improve student learning and adjust or discard those that do not work."
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct weekly grade level planning meetings to include when possible ESE support staff. 2. Monthly Data/MTSS meetings by grade level including ESE resource teachers and/or staffing specialist as part of these meetings. 3. Ensure that students with disabilities are invited to participate in after school tutoring and Saturday Academy opportunities. 4. Creation of an MTSS school team to support and train classroom teachers on the MTSS process including data collection and analysis. 5. Provide staff development to classroom teachers on effective strategies for SWD, to include but not limited to the UDL training.
Person Responsible	Charline Charles (charline.charles@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).

N/A

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 Parent and Family Engagement Plan outlines how our families can participate in various academic and informational parent events hosted by the school. Parents are encouraged to be active in their children's educational through being involved in SAC, PTA and the Addition's Volunteer Program.

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.

Rosemont will not only have a Guidance Counselor on staff this year, but a full time Social Worker to help ensure our students' social-emotional needs are being met. Through social skills groups, home visits, the Child Matters program, etc. our students will have the necessary wrap-around resources readily available when support is needed. Aspire has two counselors housed at Rosemont for additional support for students needing outside counseling. Students who are experiencing behavioral concerns, the MTSS-B process is started to determine appropriate interventions a student may need. Rosemont has two mentoring groups for our intermediate grade students: GEMS (Girls Embracing Means Success) and YMOD (Young Men of Distinction), a part of the My Brother's Keeper program. The mission of these groups is to improve the academic achievement, self-esteem, social aptitude, and avoidance of high-risk behaviors for elementary students in grades 4 & 5. We are focused on building relationships with our students that foster their success and encourages them to reach their highest potential.

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

Rosemont participates in Kindergarten Round-Up each year to register our new kindergarten students prior to the rush at the beginning of the year. The principal makes a point of meeting each new student and parent if at all possible when they are registering. The registrar also makes appointments with our new parents registering in order to give one on one attention to each family. We host both Meet the Teacher and Open House annually. Students and parents receive important information about daily schedules, procedures, curriculum and upcoming events. The beginning of the year becomes a much smoother transition for both parents and students. Fifth grade students meet with the feeder school guidance counselors each year during the second semester. The counselors visit and share information about middle school and help the students create schedules. Parent nights are then hosted at the middle school for students and parents to receive additional information. Each year the third grade teachers

host an FSA Parent Information Night to explain student progression from 3rd grade to 4th grade due to Florida State testing statutes.

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.

Title One funds are used to supplement educational activities at Rosemont Elementary School. Our funds are used to hire additional instructional resource staff that intervene and provide additional learning opportunities for the most at-risk students who are all working below grade level in small groups for math and reading. After school tutoring is available for our intermediate grades to support our identified lowest 25% students in reading and math. Additional Title I funds are used to purchase supplemental curriculum to provide needed intervention.

Title One funds are also used to support the Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) for the 2019-2020 school year and will be responsible for coordinating all community-school events. The role of the PEL is to further increase family involvement. Providing this full-time position that focuses on removing barriers that prohibit families from engaging in school events and children's education shows Rosemont Elementary School's dedication to increasing parental involvement and community engagement. In addition to coordinating school family events, the PEL will assist with such tasks as organizing transportation for parents unable to reach the school for events and providing language-to-English translation for families who are not yet able to communicate in English.

TSSSA (Turnaround School Supplemental Services) Requested funds will be utilized to provide tutors and resource teachers to facilitate small groups during tier II and tier III instruction. In an effort to narrow the achievement gap and increase student proficiency, funds will be utilized to provide students identified as performing below grade level with access to extended ELA and math instruction for an additional hour after school a minimum of two times a week. Funds will also be utilized to provide instructional resource teachers and coaches with supplements for participating in professional learning opportunities beyond their duty day.

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

As part of the GEMS and YMOD program (described above), students have the opportunity to go on field trips to visit one or two colleges each year. Rosemont holds their annual "Teach In" inviting parents, business partners and community members to visit classrooms to showcase various careers. Students are exposed to goal setting, job sharing and mentoring from our partnership with the HYATT Hotel in Orlando. Each spring a group of students are invited to the HYATT for an all day job shadowing experience in the Hotel/Lodging Industry.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Rosemont Elementary School will continue to build teacher capacity in the areas of standards-based instruction and delivery across all content areas.	\$55,000.00
---	--------	--	--------------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	Other Federal		\$25,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide professional development that focuses on academic rigor, direct instruction, creating high academic and character standards. Provide teachers/coaches supplements for participating in planning and professional opportunities beyond their duty day.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	Other Federal		\$30,000.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers will receive an annual supplement. Funds for recruiting and retaining instructional personnel.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Rosemont Elementary School will continue to build teacher capacity in the area of data analysis and data-driven instruction to increase student proficiency and close achievement gaps.				\$213,290.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	Other Federal		\$136,290.00
			<i>Notes: Provide students identified as performing below grade level with access to extended ELA and Math instruction for an additional hour after school a minimum of two times a week. (After school tutoring and/or Saturday Academy) Fund teachers to support the tutoring programs. Provide tutors and resource teachers to facilitate small groups during tier II and Tier III instruction.</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	Other Federal		\$77,000.00
			<i>Notes: Establish clearly defined and measurable high academic and character standards. Purchase additional resource teachers.</i>			
Total:						\$268,290.00