

Marion County Public Schools

# Romeo Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

# Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Houle

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2019

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-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) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (54%)<br>2017-18: C (44%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: C (46%)<br>2014-15: C (44%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A |
| * 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 Marion 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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

## Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[ no web address on file ]

### 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>KG-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                     | 51%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | 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. Romeo Elementary 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.**

At Romeo Elementary we are always learning.

### 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   |
|--------------------|------------------------|---|
| Parker,<br>Suzette | Principal              | <p>The school based leadership team is comprised of members of the Synergy Teams and Problem Solving Teams. Administrators will work together to oversee all action steps and support the other members of the School Leadership Team.</p>  |
|                    |                        | <p>The leadership team identifies focus areas and problem solves for improvements. They set goals that are articulated in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). An action plan is created to address each goal and monitor the progress. The leadership team consistently monitors and supports student achievement data and adjusts plans based on learner needs. The leadership team works with staff to support instruction, management, and student learning. The synergy team track EWS and problem solves to address specific areas of need based on trends and individual students.</p> |
| Carsey,<br>Candace | School<br>Counselor    | <p>The school based leadership team is comprised of members of the Synergy Teams and Problem Solving Teams. Administrators will work together to oversee all action steps and support the other members of the School Leadership Team.</p>  |
|                    |                        | <p>The leadership team identifies focus areas and problem solves for improvements. They set goals that are articulated in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). An action plan is created to address each goal and monitor the progress. The leadership team consistently monitors and supports student achievement data and adjusts plans based on learner needs. The leadership team works with staff to support instruction, management, and student learning. The synergy team track EWS and problem solves to address specific areas of need based on trends and individual students.</p> |
| Renfro,<br>Edward  | Instructional<br>Coach | <p>The school based leadership team is comprised of members of the Synergy Teams and Problem Solving Teams. Administrators will work together to oversee all action steps and support the other members of the School Leadership Team.</p>  |
|                    |                        | <p>The leadership team identifies focus areas and problem solves for improvements. They set goals that are articulated in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). An</p>   |



| Name            | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
|                 |                     | <p>action plan is created to address each goal and monitor the progress. The leadership team consistently monitors and supports student achievement data and adjusts plans based on learner needs. The leadership team works with staff to support instruction, management, and student learning. The synergy team track EWS and problem solves to address specific areas of need based on trends and individual students.</p>   |
| Williams, Susan | Assistant Principal | <p>The school based leadership team is comprised of members of the Synergy Teams and Problem Solving Teams. Administrators will work together to oversee all action steps and support the other members of the School Leadership Team.</p> <p>The leadership team identifies focus areas and problem solves for improvements. They set goals that are articulated in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). An action plan is created to address each goal and monitor the progress. The leadership team consistently monitors and supports student achievement data and adjusts plans based on learner needs. The leadership team works with staff to support instruction, management, and student learning. The synergy team track EWS and problem solves to address specific areas of need based on trends and individual students.</p> |
| Jeter, Lorelee  | Dean                | <p>The school based leadership team is comprised of members of the Synergy Teams and Problem Solving Teams. Administrators will work together to oversee all action steps and support the other members of the School Leadership Team.</p> <p>The leadership team identifies focus areas and problem solves for improvements. They set goals that are articulated in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). An action plan is created to address each goal and monitor the progress. The leadership team consistently monitors and supports student achievement data and adjusts plans based on learner needs. The leadership team works with staff to support instruction, management, and student learning. The synergy team track EWS and problem solves to</p>   |

| Name        | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------|---------------------|--|
|             |                     | address specific areas of need based on trends and individual students.  |
| Epps, Tonya | Instructional Coach | <p>The school based leadership team is comprised of members of the Synergy Teams and Problem Solving Teams. Administrators will work together to oversee all action steps and support the other members of the School Leadership Team.</p> <p>The leadership team identifies focus areas and problem solves for improvements. They set goals that are articulated in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). An action plan is created to address each goal and monitor the progress. The leadership team consistently monitors and supports student achievement data and adjusts plans based on learner needs. The leadership team works with staff to support instruction, management, and student learning. The synergy team track EWS and problem solves to address specific areas of need based on trends and individual students.</p> |

## 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     | 97          | 125 | 121 | 143 | 100 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 725   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 28          | 29  | 17  | 21  | 19  | 34  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 148   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 8           | 10  | 13  | 2   | 0   | 18  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 58  | 29  | 63  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 150   |

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 | 11          | 16 | 25 | 21 | 10 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 142   |

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 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| 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)**

36

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

Wednesday 7/31/2019

### 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     | 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 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 | 0           | 10 | 10 | 18 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |

### 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     | 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 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 | 0           | 10 | 10 | 18 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |

## 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             | 49%    | 47%      | 57%   | 49%    | 52%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 58%    | 56%      | 58%   | 50%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 48%    | 52%      | 53%   | 40%    | 53%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 55%    | 51%      | 63%   | 50%    | 52%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 61%    | 58%      | 62%   | 40%    | 54%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 61%    | 49%      | 51%   | 27%    | 43%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 49%    | 47%      | 53%   | 37%    | 51%      | 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     | 97 (0)                            | 125 (0) | 121 (0) | 143 (0) | 100 (0) | 139 (0)  | 725 (0)   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 28 (10)                           | 29 (52) | 17 (57) | 21 (56) | 19 (44) | 34 (61)  | 148 (280) |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0)                             | 0 (4)   | 0 (3)   | 0 (2)   | 0 (4)   | 0 (2)    | 0 (15)    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 8 (0)                             | 10 (7)  | 13 (12) | 2 (23)  | 0 (2)   | 18 (9)   | 51 (53)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 58 (15) | 29 (54) | 63 (102) | 150 (171) |

**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 | 43%    | 44%      | -1%                        | 58%   | -15%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 46%      | -4%                        | 57%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 52%    | 49%      | 3%                         | 58%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 39%    | 43%      | -4%                        | 56%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 50%    | 45%      | 5%                         | 56%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 52%    | 46%      | 6%                         | 55%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 50%    | 49%      | 1%                         | 62%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 48%      | 6%                         | 62%   | -8%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 65%    | 54%      | 11%                        | 64%   | 1%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 43%    | 47%      | -4%                        | 62%   | -19%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 44%    | 45%      | -1%                        | 60%   | -16%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 45%    | 50%      | -5%                        | 61%   | -16%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 46%    | 44%      | 2%                         | 53%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 53%    | 49%      | 4%                         | 55%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 16       | 61     | 61          | 29        | 74      | 72           | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 39       | 59     | 52          | 46        | 54      | 55           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 57       |        |             | 69        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 42       | 57     | 52          | 48        | 53      | 59           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 68       |        |             | 83        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 61     | 46          | 57        | 69      | 75           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 57     | 46          | 50        | 59      | 63           | 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                                       | 17       | 30     | 35          | 15        | 43      | 44           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 21       | 33     | 39          | 37        | 33      | 32           | 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       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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 | 62   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 443  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 46   |
| 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                                       | 50   |
| 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                                    | 63  |
| 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  | 51  |
| 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   | 76  |
| 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   | 59  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 53  |
| 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.**

English Language Arts performance of the bottom quartile was the area with lowest performance. Many of these students are our students with disabilities who are functioning one or two grade levels behind. Performance of SWD is a targeted area of improvement for our school. The implementation of research based interventions in reading with paraprofessional support targeting this group of students will help raise their performance.

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

Science Achievement was the area which demonstrated the greatest decline from the previous year. Factors contributing to this decline were lack of science based inquiry lessons. More hands on science inquiry lessons using the 5E approach will be implemented with fidelity this year. A dedicated science lab will make this goal easier for teachers to attain.

**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.**

Math Achievement in 3rd & 5th Grade are the areas demonstrating the greatest gap when compared to the state average. These areas are showing positive growth at our school. Many of our students are 1 or 2 grade levels behind. They are making steady learning gains, but are still not proficient on grade level material. Our teachers will focus on incorporating ongoing, formative assessment. Standards based teaching and re-teaching will be aimed directly at the needs of the individual students

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

Fourth Grade Math Achievement demonstrated the greatest improvement as a direct result of the dedication to our fourth grade teachers in incorporating ongoing, formative assessment. Standards based teaching and re-teaching were aimed directly at the needs of the individual students.

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

One area of concern that we will continue to target is student attendance. We will continue to foster relationships with families to help them understand the importance of regular school attendance and the impacts of poor attendance on student performance.

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

1. Reading proficiency of all learners
2. Reading performance of bottom quartile
3. Math inquiry and discourse
4. Science inquiry and discourse
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement



**Areas of Focus:****#1**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Tier 1 Instruction: Student discourse & questioning   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Student achievement in math will increase 3% as measured by proficiency data on the FSA Reading and Math Assessment. Students in grades K-2 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in math from AP1 to AP3 in iReady.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | <p>If teachers incorporate more student discourse and higher order questions in their instruction then student achievement on FSA in both Reading and Math will increase by 3% across grade levels in both content areas. Students in grades K-2 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in math from AP1 to AP3 in iReady.</p> <p>3rd Grade: ELA from 43% to 46% MA from 50% to 53%</p> <p>4th Grade: ELA from 52% to 55% MA from 65% to 70%</p> <p>5th Grade: ELA from 50% to 53% MA from 44% to 47%</p> <p>AP1 data to be populated as it becomes available</p> |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Susan Williams (susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices point to the development of lessons using standards aligned content with the appropriate level of rigor and the employment of high impact instructional strategies. The focus of our work will center around strategies outlined by both Hattie and Marzano.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Romeo Elementary student proficiency and learning gains in reading and math on the FSA over the past 2 years indicate that continued development and focus on Tier 1 instruction are necessary to continue the positive trends in achievement and academic growth demonstrated by our student learning.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher PD for incorporation and writing of higher order questions</li> <li>2. Book Study, "The Fundamental 5"</li> <li>3. Weekly math and/or reading collaborative planning</li> <li>4. Reading Interventions that are both research based and based on individual student needs</li> <li>5. Teacher led PD for both Kagan strategies and other high yield instructional strategies</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)  |

| #2  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Tier 1 Instruction: Standards Based Planning and Assessment  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Student achievement in math will increase 3% as measured by proficiency data on the FSA Reading and Math Assessment. Students in grades K-2 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in math from AP1 to AP3 in iReady.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | <p>If teachers use formative assessment to plan and deliver Florida Standards aligned instruction in Reading and Math, then student achievement on FSA in both Reading and Math will increase 3% as measured by proficiency data on the FSA Reading and Math Assessment. Students in grades K-2 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in math from AP1 to AP3 in iReady.</p> <p>3rd Grade: ELA from 43% to 46% MA from 50% to 53%<br/> 4th Grade: ELA from 52% to 55% MA from 65% to 70%<br/> 5th Grade: ELA from 50% to 53% MA from 44% to 47%</p> <p>AP1 data to be populated as it becomes available</p> |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Susan Williams (susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices point to the development of lessons using standards aligned content with the appropriate level of rigor and the employment of high impact instructional strategies. The focus of our work will center around strategies outlined by both Hattie and Marzano.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Romeo Elementary student proficiency and learning gains in reading and math on the FSA over the past 2 years indicate that continued development and focus on Tier 1 instruction are necessary to continue the positive trends in achievement and academic growth demonstrated by our student learning.  |
| Action Step   |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher PD for ongoing formative assessment and backward design</li> <li>2. Book Study, "The Fundamental 5"</li> <li>3. Weekly math and/or reading collaborative planning</li> <li>4. Reading Interventions that are both research based and based on individual student needs</li> <li>5. Teacher led PD for both Kagan strategies and other high yield instructional strategies</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)   |

| #3  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Home-School Partnership   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | All students in grades K-5 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in reading and math from AP1 to AP3 in iReady.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | <p>If we provide parents and families capacity building strategies that address and promote positive home environments, then students will arrive at school with capacity to learn as demonstrated by a 3% increase in student achievement on FSA (grades 3-5) and 5% increase of students (grades K-2) performing on grade level in reading and math from AP1 to AP3 in iReady.</p> <p>3rd Grade: ELA from 43% to 46% MA from 50% to 53%<br/> 4th Grade: ELA from 52% to 55% MA from 65% to 70%<br/> 5th Grade: ELA from 50% to 53% MA from 44% to 47%</p> <p>AP1 data to be populated as it becomes available</p> |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Implementation of a family school framework which fosters 2 way communication and cooperation between schools and families. Initial implementation will utilize the Family-School Partnership template outlined at <a href="http://www.familyschool.org">http://www.familyschool.org</a>  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Research demonstrates that effective schools have high levels of parental and community involvement. This involvement is strongly related to improved student learning, attendance and behaviour. Family involvement can have a major impact on student learning, regardless of the social or cultural background of the family.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Class Dojo messages to parents bi-weekly</li> <li>2. Strong Fathers-Strong Families Events</li> <li>3. Skylert Messages and Newsletters</li> <li>4. Parent Engagement Events</li> <li>5. Daily Announcements link to parents daily on Dojo</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)  |

#### 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.**

Romeo Elementary plans to encourage sustainable and effective partnerships between all members of the school community, including teachers, families, and students. These partnerships should:

- view each partner as making equally valuable contributions, while respecting different contributions;
- respect student needs and preferences;
- address barriers to involvement in schools by families, in particular Indigenous families, and actively help previously uninvolved families to become involved;
- create better programs, opportunities and learning for students;
- give families appropriate opportunities to contribute to school decision-making and governance; and
- contribute to professional satisfaction for principals and teachers.

Our site-based Parent & Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) will describe our commitment to engage parents and families in the education of their children and to build the capacity to implement family engagement strategies and activities designed to achieve the school and student academic achievement goals. Through the following capacity building events; we will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Title I Annual Meeting  
Distance Monthly Capacity Building  
Parent Conference Night  
Strong Families Science Night  
Strong Fathers Reading  
Strong Families Math

PFEP Goal: If Romeo Elementary School provides capacity-building strategies to parents and families that address and promote positive home environments then students will arrive at school with the capacity to learn as measured by i-Ready diagnostic data.

**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.**

MCPS Psychological Services supports the united efforts of parents, educators, and the community to raise student performance. Psychological Services provides assessment, consultation, progress monitoring, and mental health services to improve the academic and emotional well-being of all students.

Crisis Response Resources:

Information and resources to assist parents and educators help students through a time of crisis:

Talking to Children About Violence: Tips for Parents and Teachers

Bullies and Victims: A Primer for Parents

When Grief/Loss Hits Close to Home: Tips for Caregivers

Care for the Caregiver: Tips for Families and Educators

What You CAN Do - Meaningful Action Matters in the Face of Violence

Helping Children Cope With Traumatic Events

Trauma Informed Care Resources

Suicide Prevention - 13 Reasons Why: Information Sheet and Resource Guide

Prevención del Suicidio Juvenil: Consejos para Padres y Educadores?

**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 in both Kindergarten and pre-kindergarten 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.

Early learning, elementary, middle and high school curriculum maps are shared and utilized throughout all levels of education to ensure an alignment of standards and expectations to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of student in transition from one school level to another.

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.

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.

Providing differentiated instruction for students at all levels is a best practice to meet students' needs in mastering the Florida Standards (FS)/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS).

Instructionally sound strategies for grouping students will be used to enhance the academic achievement of all students. Any grouping of students shall provide opportunities for the regrouping of students during a portion of the school day (i.e., within the general education classroom, during specials, lunch, or other portion of the school week).

Ability groups are organized according to accelerated needs such as higher-level coursework or remedial needs of individual students. Ability group configurations are flexible and continually monitored for student progress and movement.

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.

Each site Principal is responsible for site-based inventory of resources/services as well as necessary problem solving and application.

**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.

Romeo Elementary will continue to participate in the MCPS Soft Skills initiative. We promote the top five soft skills as identified by Marion County business and industry leaders. The five soft skills of emphasis are:

1. Dependability and Reliability (to include attendance and punctuality – 98% attendance is the expectation)
2. Work Ethic
3. Communication (to include all communication, both personal and professional)
4. Positive Attitude
5. Team Work

Additionally, our guidance counselor spends time discussing careers and implementing interest surveys to our 5th grade students. Local communities and businesses support career awareness during our school career fair which occurs in the Fall.

The district of 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 level (K-12) and subject area, so they will be prepared to succeed in college, a career and be functional in society on a daily basis. At the elementary level, this is established through STEM and STEAM curriculum, off and on campus field trips, and business and community volunteers.

## Part V: Budget

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

|   |        |   |        |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Tier 1 Instruction: Student discourse & questioning         | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Tier 1 Instruction: Standards Based Planning and Assessment | \$0.00 |

|        |        |   |        |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Home-School Partnership | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |