

Polk County Public Schools

Rochelle School Of The Arts



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/rochellearts>

Demographics

Principal: Carol Griffin

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	92%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (61%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Polk 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/rochellearts>

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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Rochelle School of the Arts is committed to doing whatever it takes to provide an enriched and rigorous curriculum through the arts and academics in a challenging environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Rochelle School of the Arts will prepare all students for the future by providing a rigorous curriculum along with the active study of the visual and performing arts.

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
Ward, Julie	Principal	Oversee all functions of the school and the School Improvement Plan
Brackman, Lee	Assistant Principal	
Tidwell, Donna	Other	
Mayes, Kim	Instructional Coach	
Grooms, Rochelle	School Counselor	
Bryant, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	
Nolen, Kim	Other	
Ross, Ariel	Instructional Coach	
Whiteside, Heather	Other	

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	57	70	77	88	78	87	107	95	102	0	0	0	0	761	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	8	1	5	0	6	5	9	0	0	0	0	48	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	8	8	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	13	24	25	24	20	0	0	0	0	108	

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	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	9	0	0	0	0	22	

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
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)

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

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	2	8	5	1	3	7	11	18	18	0	0	0	0	73	
One or more suspensions	2	5	7	6	4	5	12	19	8	0	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	11	12	9	16	21	11	0	0	0	0	80	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	12	15	30	17	11	0	0	0	0	97	

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	1	1	0	8	8	4	17	20	14	0	0	0	0	73	

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	2	8	5	1	3	7	11	18	18	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	2	5	7	6	4	5	12	19	8	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	11	12	9	16	21	11	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	12	15	30	17	11	0	0	0	0	97

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	1	1	0	8	8	4	17	20	14	0	0	0	0	73

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	63%	61%	61%	58%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	58%	59%	52%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	49%	54%	43%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	59%	61%	62%	57%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%	56%	59%	54%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	52%	47%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	52%	56%	52%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	79%	78%	71%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	57 (0)	70 (0)	77 (0)	88 (0)	78 (0)	87 (0)	107 (0)	95 (0)	102 (0)	761 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (2)	5 (8)	8 (5)	1 (1)	5 (3)	0 (7)	6 (11)	5 (18)	9 (18)	48 (73)
One or more suspensions	0 (2)	0 (5)	0 (7)	0 (6)	0 (4)	0 (5)	0 (12)	0 (19)	0 (8)	0 (68)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (11)	1 (12)	0 (9)	3 (16)	8 (21)	8 (11)	22 (80)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (12)	13 (12)	24 (15)	25 (30)	24 (17)	20 (11)	108 (97)

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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	48%	17%	58%	7%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	60%	47%	13%	56%	4%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	64%	48%	16%	54%	10%
	2018	51%	41%	10%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
07	2019	59%	42%	17%	52%	7%
	2018	49%	42%	7%	51%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	63%	48%	15%	56%	7%
	2018	56%	49%	7%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	56%	-5%	64%	-13%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	54%	51%	3%	60%	-6%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2019	48%	47%	1%	55%	-7%
	2018	47%	40%	7%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2019	60%	39%	21%	54%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	40%	2%	54%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	38%	35%	3%	46%	-8%
	2018	49%	34%	15%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	48%	41%	7%	48%	0%
	2018	43%	42%	1%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	70%	11%	71%	10%
2018	97%	84%	13%	71%	26%
Compare		-16%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%
2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	95%	41%	54%	56%	39%
Compare		5%			

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	21	33	41	25	29	18					
ELL	53	64		42	27						
BLK	50	52	47	48	43	41	25	65	89		
HSP	66	59	53	61	55	57	44	85	67		
MUL	63	64		56	50						
WHT	81	64	54	75	57	48	68	97	92		
FRL	55	52	45	51	46	46	28	80	78		
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	11	48	56	4	38	40					
ELL	28	44		39	44						
BLK	41	44	49	44	50	51	28	90	86		
HSP	56	54	60	55	46	28	56				
MUL	54	39		58	65		64				
WHT	72	50	36	74	62	48	76	100	72		
FRL	46	43	46	50	53	48	40	95	72		
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	10	21	25	10	29	30					
ELL	8	46		8	38						
BLK	45	43	34	43	44	39	31	57	53		
HSP	58	58	63	56	60	61	55	79	88		
MUL	64	55		56	45						
WHT	76	60	61	76	67	65	76	92	86		
FRL	49	46	43	47	48	40	31	68	53		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	51
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	58
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	71
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.

Lowest performance was in Math - 4th gr (drop from 63% to 51% proficiency). This grade level previously had moderate to low achievement, but showed an increase in 17-18 (63%); possibly contributing factors could include a lack of instructional focus needed to maintain this level of achievement.

Lowest 25% LG (4th & 5th & 8th)

Science - 5th grade dropped from 52% to 40% proficiency, 8th grade held at 48% from prior year, but needs improvement. The 5th and 8th grade Science scores have not increased beyond 50% in recent years. A possible contributing factor may be inconsistencies with non-tested grade levels' science instruction.

Students with Disabilities proficiency in ELA was weak, and was the school's only ESSA subgroup (21% compared to 63% for all groups) and Math (25% compared to 59%).

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

Math for 4th grade declined from 63% to 51%, a 12% drop. Possible contributing factors include inconsistencies w/paper-based vs computer-based practice with assessments; rigor not maintained from prior year; and students struggling with fact fluency impacting focus on more rigorous standards. Students who struggle with reading and writing also struggle with math achievement since many assessment items are word-problem based.

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.

Gr 4, 5, 6 in math; Trends with this grade level grouping has been noted as a struggle over multiple years; fluency with basic facts impacts understanding and application with more rigorous standards and expectations; Inconsistencies with paper- vs. computer-based testing and practice may have had a negative impact with the 18-19 FSA testing.

Gr. 5 Science - Prior year grade levels not investing time in science instruction (ELA and Math taking priority); first year of STEM scopes new curricular resource; school initiative to create inter-disciplinary units with science standards took energy and focus away from a standards only approach with curriculum maps.

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

ELA in all grades improved and was above district and state averages for all tested grade levels, 3rd-8th. We fully implemented Readers Workshop in all K-5 and worked to incorporate Learning Science International (LSI) strategies of Learning Targets and Target/Task Alignment in ELA. Middle School ELA incorporated novel studies which were differentiated by ability and/or interest. Focus on standards-based correlation with learning tasks, learning targets, and assessments in all classrooms.

Professional Development for Readers Workshop, Assessment Alignment, Achieve 3000, and LSI.

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

The number of students in Achievement Level 1 and the number of students with out of school suspensions are significant. Both of these are areas we would like to reduce. Course failures in ELA and Math with middle school students is also notable.

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

1. ELA - Continue upward trend of overall achievement and learning gains; SWD - overall achievement and learning gains
2. Math - 4th-8th, non-accelerated students; SWD - overall achievement and learning gains
3. Science - 5th & 8th, improving proficiency; SWD - overall achievement and learning gains
4. School Climate - PBIS, Sanford Harmony, Panther Pride
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math
Rationale	Math Achievement for the previous year showed an increase of 3% in overall proficiency for the 18-19 school, however showed a decline of 3% in the learning gains and a decline in the bottom 25% learning gains of 5%. The students with disability group made an increase from 4% in the 17-18 school year to 25% in the 18-19 school year for proficiency but is still below the 41% threshold.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The math proficiency for grades 3-8 will increase by 3% from the previous school year (62%). The math learning gains will increase from 59% to 62%, math learning gains will increase from 50% to 55%, math bottom 25% learning gains will increase from 46% to 51% in the 18-19 school year. Proficiency for Students with Disabilities will increase from 25% to 30%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Learning Sciences International (LSI) strategies of learning targets, success criteria, target task alignment, student agency& formative assessments will be employed and adding a Math Interventionist with Title 1 funds to provide targeted intervention will support improvement in Math achievement. Implementation of new math program K-5 called Freckle. Continue to monitor and improve the use of Imagine Math in 6-8. Use of after school tutoring for students identified in grades 4-6. Math Interventionist will assist with students not making mastery on grade level standards and working in small groups to help improve learning gains and proficiency in grades 4-6.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Learning Science International, LSI, structures of Target/Task Alignment, Learning Targets, and Success Criteria will be utilized in Math instruction. "STAR Math" will also support progress monitoring of students' growth and areas of need. Imagine Math is supported by the district as an appropriate, prescriptive, individualized approach for students in Intensive Math classes. Freckle is also supported by the district for students in grades K-5 to individualize skills acquisition & practice via technology. Utilizing a Math Interventionist is an appropriate strategy to provide greater one-on-one support with math fluency, preview strategies, and additional practice.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Math Interventionist-will work with students during the first nine weeks to assist them with fluency especially grades 4-6. During the second and third nine weeks students will be identified based on the STAR math data for those who need additional support to gain mastery of standards, using pre-teaching as well as remediation strategies. 2. LSI strategies - During Collaborative Planning with each grade level, the Math Coach and teacher teams will develop learning targets, success criteria and formative assessments that meet the intended learning and depth of knowledge, ensuring the tasks and assessments are aligned to the target and success criteria. 3. Student Agency - students learn to advocate for their learning by determining their needs based on analysis of formative or summative assessments. Students identify areas of needs using a self-assessment and goal-setting tool. 4. Strategies to assist with students with disabilities in math - chunking assignments, accommodations based on IEPs (reduced assignments, additional time, etc.), explicit instruction with academic vocabulary. 5. After school tutoring - Small group instruction, based on individual student's needs

6. The school instructional team will continue with LSI full-day trainings and a team will also attend the summer 2020 conference to continue to build capacity and understanding of effective strategies for rigorous learning.
7. ESE teacher will incorporate critical thinking, test taking, and problem solving strategies in the Learning Strategies class to support Students With Disabilities developing these skills which are essential in math.
8. ESE teachers and general education teachers will have a collaborative planning time once per month to provide an opportunity to share and plan appropriate instruction and pre-teaching for students with disabilities (in math and other subjects).
9. Schedule elementary Alpha teachers (gifted program) to provide math enrichment in 2nd-5th grades one time per week to increase opportunities for acceleration, critical thinking, and problem-solving among strongest math students.

Person Responsible	Ariel Ross (ariel.ross@polk-fl.net)
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------

#2	
Title	ELA
Rationale	Achievement in ELA showed positive improvement by grade levels (exceeding district and state averages by 4%-20% in all grades 4-8) and overall improvement in 18-19 (63%) compared to 17-18 (54%). A significant discrepancy exists in the Students with Disabilities subgroup in both achievement and learning gains. (All school - 63%, SWD - 21%; All school learning gains - 58%, SWD - 33%). Achievement in English Language Arts reflects students' literacy, comprehension, and ability to process written and spoken language and these are critical areas for confidence, skills, and success in life. Our school wants to continue the upward trend for all students and decrease the achievement gap for SWD.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Total proficiency and learning gains for all students in grades 3-8 will increase from 63% to 65% proficiency and Learning Gains from 58% to 61%. Students with Disabilities will show an increase from 21% proficiency to 30% and Learning Gains from 33% to 38%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Learning Science International, LSI, structures of Target/Task Alignment, Learning Targets, and Success Criteria will be utilized in ELA instruction. "Readers Workshop" was fully implemented in K-5 in 2018-19, and "Phonics Units of Study" will be fully implemented in K-2 in 19-20 also. "STAR Reading" and "Early Lit" will also support progress monitoring of students' growth and areas of need. "Leveled Literacy Intervention" materials will be used with one group of students each in grades 1, 2, and 3. "Step-Up to Writing" will be used in K-5 to bring continuity to writing instruction. Teachers in grades 6-8 will utilize the district's curriculum maps for pacing and will supplement with texts and novel studies, providing for interest and ability differentiation. Social Studies teachers in middle school will also implement "DBQ" (Document-Based Question) texts and writing assignments to reinforce text-based writing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LSI strategies are rooted in strong, effective pedagogical practice - using Learning Targets that are aligned to standards and assessments (Success Criteria), teachers and students understand the learning best. Readers Workshop and Phonics Units of Study are well-founded in evidence-based research, based primarily in work done through Teachers' College at Columbia University. When students read extensively in their "just right" or zone of proximal development and are monitored and pushed forward with more challenging text at growth points, their reading skills increase. The LLI program of reading intervention complements the Readers Workshop structure of identifying students' current level and building on that foundation to accelerate learning. Coupling reading instruction with appropriate grade level writing standards and skills, particularly with content-area texts provides a foundation for integrated learning and growth.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full-implementation of Readers Workshop (K-5) and Phonics Units of Study (K-2), including Mini-Lessons, Conferencing, Use of Anchor Charts, Running Records, and independent reading time with appropriate level books for each student. 2. Through Collaborative Planning Sessions, teachers and the Instructional Coach will determine the Learning Targets and Success Criteria for all lessons, reviewing or creating formative and summative assessments that align to the standards.

3. STAR Reading and Early Lit will be used 3 times per year as grade level, class, and individual student progress monitoring data.
4. Parents will be provided STAR data at Open House, Mid-Year Portfolio Night, and parent conferences, along with information on methods of supportive actions to use at home.
5. Classroom observations by the Reading Coach and Administration will occur weekly to provide feedback on instructional practices, observe the students' learning, and determine areas of need for professional learning and instructional materials acquisition.
6. Professional Development will be provided to K-5 teachers on LSI strategies, Phonics Units of Study, Readers Workshop, and Assessment Alignment. Teachers in grades 6-8 will also participate in PD related to LSI strategies, DBQ utilization, and Assessment Alignment.
7. Students With Disabilities will participate in all Tier 1 instruction and learning activities. They will receive support as needed for the Tier 1 instruction, and will also have Tier 2 and 3 support when discrepancies exist in achievement as noted through FSA proficiency, STAR progress monitoring, IEP goal needs and classroom performance.
8. ESE teachers will participate in monthly Multi-Tiered System of Supports grade level meetings with regular education teachers and will be engaged in Student Success Team meetings to contribute to the intervention strategies for students.
9. Leveled Literacy Intervention materials will be utilized as a Tier 2 intervention to specifically target those students performing significantly below expectations. Other Tier 2 strategies will include re-grouping students for interventions based on similar needs (phonics, comprehension, word study, etc.).
10. Accelerated Reader will be used to provide additional reading and comprehension practice, with teachers carefully monitoring students reading levels and comprehension averages.
11. Resources to supplement ELA and Special Area teachers (Arts, PE) will be secured to enhance literacy instruction across the curriculum. (Ex: "reading" music activates literacy and memory skills similar to written text.)
12. Elementary classes will utilize periodicals such as Scholastic News and Studies Weekly to supplement Science and Social Studies content and support reading across the curriculum.
13. Parent Involvement materials and events will be implemented to insure parents have the information necessary to understand their child's reading achievement and how to best support from home.
14. One additional ESE teacher was hired as a result of a request to the district to meet the needs of the school.
15. Testing coordinator and ESE teachers will ensure accommodations are used for routine classroom instruction and tests.

Person Responsible Kim Mayes (kimberlee.mayes@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Science Achievement for the previous year showed a decreased by 3% in overall proficiency from the 18-19 school year. The 5th & 8th grade Science data from 18-19 showed we had approximately 35% of our students scoring in AL 2 in both grades, with over half of those students in the upper half of AL 2. A significant discrepancy exists in the Achievement level in 2019 from the school (44%) to the district (52%) to the state (56%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The science proficiency for grades 5 and 8 will increase by 6% from the previous school year to 50% for the 19-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	LSI, learning targets, success criteria, target task alignment, student agency, formative assessments, support of the Regional Based Science Coach. A school-based coach will assist with Collaborative Planning sessions with standards alignment, target/task alignment, learning targets, and success criteria.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LSI strategies are rooted in strong, effective pedagogical practice - using Learning Targets that are aligned to standards and assessments (Success Criteria), teachers and students understand the learning best.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Align all tasks to the rigor and DOK of the standards in all areas, especially in 5th and 8th grades using the state Test Item Analysis tool. 2. The Regional Based Science Coach will meet with the staff at our monthly STEAM planning meetings. The Coach will attend Collaborative Planning sessions at least once per month. The Regional Coach will also visit classrooms for walk-throughs and feedback. 4. Elementary teachers will continue to create and refine Project Based Learning units in Science. 5. Teachers will analyze the test data from 18/19 to identify areas of strength and deficiency to adjust instruction for current students. 6. 4th-8th grade teachers will use the District Quarterly Assessments to check for student understanding, analyze areas in need of further instruction, and students will use a reflection tool to establish goals for additional learning. 7. Field trips will be incorporated to enhance the learning within the Science and Project-Based Learning units.
Person Responsible	Ariel Ross (ariel.ross@polk-fl.net)

#4	
Title	School Climate
Rationale	Based on the diverse population of our school, the number of suspensions in 2018-2019, attendance rate, and the passing of Senate Bill 7030 (Mental Health), school climate will be addressed in 2019-2020 school year. Our school wants to ensure all students feel safe, included, and have a desire to come to school. Engaging parents in their children's education and learning will positively impact the school climate.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Suspensions will decrease in number from 68 in 2018-2019 to 60 in 2019-2020. Attendance rate of students will be 95% or higher. 80% or higher of elementary students will receive the monthly Paw Card rewards and 80% of middle school students will receive the 9 week rewards. Elementary teachers will have conferences with 100% of their students' parents and at least 60% of middle school students' parents will attend one or more evening parent events.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lee Brackman (lee.brackman@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Positive Behavior Intervention Support; Sanford Harmony; Panther Pride Days; Mental Health Classes for middle school students (when information is received from the district); District mandated health lessons which include Bullying, Health, and Internet Safety Lessons; Emergenetics as a tool to recognize and educate students and teachers on thinking and behavioral preferences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS is designed to promote positive behavior interventions daily around campus. Sanford Harmony is used to promote social-emotional learning (SEL). Panther Pride Days build character traits in students. Mental Health and District Health lessons will improve mental health awareness and well-being. Emergenetics supports appreciating individual differences and strengths and the ways these contribute to the function of groups, as well as empathy for others. Home-school communication is vital to students' success.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PBIS will be used school-wide to recognize and reinforce positive behavior and choices with all students. 2. Elementary teachers will use Sanford Harmony daily to teach social skills lessons and build community in their classrooms. 3. Middle School teachers will use Panther Pride Days (once a month) to teach social skills and build community in our school. 4. Mental Health and other Health Classes will be taught to all middle school students (as prescribed by the district). 5. Attendance will be monitored by teachers, terminal operator, and school social worker. 6. Emergenetics STEP questionnaire will be administered to any new 5th-8th grade students, followed by the Meeting of the Minds training. 7. Teachers will implement various teaming structures based on Emergenetics thinking or behavioral preferences. 8. Open House nights will be held in September 2019 and will include a data focus, providing individual student reports to each parent from the STAR tests administered in August. Information will be presented to provide parents with the knowledge needed to understand the data. 9. A parent education event will be held in the 1st 9 weeks to provide parents with additional support on ways to support the children's learning at home. Additional information will be provided for parents of middle school students in Intensive Reading and

Math classes regarding the data generated from those programs.

10. Agendas will be utilized K-8 as a means of teaching students organizational strategies, planning, and goal setting and to provide teachers and parents a daily, written means of communication. Home-school communication folders will be used in K-5 to establish routines related to review of school work at home.

Person Responsible Rochelle Grooms (rochelle.grooms@polk-fl.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).

Rochelle has been involved with a Magnet School Assistance Program grant from the US DOE for the past 3 years, and the 2019-20 school year is the 4th and final year of grant funding and accountability. There are initiatives within the grant we will continue to focus on to build capacity for sustainability beyond this school year. Examples include financial sustainability of the Fab Lab, continued integration of our Arts programs with academic areas of focus, "thinking like a quad" with Emergenetics structures across all grade levels, and continuing to offer a variety of arts and arts-related courses for students to align with our magnet theme.

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.

Effective communication of school activities and events will occur, supporting families having the appropriate information to engage in school activities, especially their student's academic standing and progress, Parent Informational events, and the Fine Arts Programs offered at Rochelle. The Parent Portal is an online system that provides parents with the opportunity to view their student's grades and progress throughout each grading period. Volunteers will be connected to their areas of interest so that the school can be supported in classrooms, departments, administratively, financially, and in special programs.

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.

Two Guidance Counselors (one for elementary and one for middle school) are full-time staff members, and they work with teachers, students, and families to address social-emotional areas of concern. The Counselors also support conflict resolution issues between students, and work to build these skill sets with students. We collect data from the instructional staff through weekly grade level meetings, monthly Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) meetings, Student Success Team (SST) meetings, conversations with our guidance counselors, discipline data and Early Warning Systems (EWS).

Teachers will identify students who may benefit from the additional support of a mentor. Options exist for students to anonymously report potential bullying incidents and processes exist for investigation, conflict-resolution, and/or disciplinary measures to support social-emotional health. The Elementary Guidance Counselor will provide in-class guidance lessons equipping students with interpersonal, problem-solving, and other social skills. All students will participate in monthly "Panther Pride" days (homeroom in elementary, groups of approximately 15 for middle school) for character education, interpersonal skills, and presentation skills instruction, strengthening students' confidence and social-emotional skill sets.

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

Rochelle promotes vertical collaboration between teachers to ensure that subject areas are developing lessons using anchor standards. These lessons should incorporate similar standards from previous grade levels to build on the students' prior knowledge. Rochelle encourages students to strive for advanced classes and course work. Vertical teams work together to coordinate the instruction, remediation, and enrichment efforts for students.

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.

Grade level (K-5) and department teams (6-8) meet weekly for Collaborative Planning sessions focused on aligned standards-based instruction and assessments. Members of the Leadership Team support and guide this process. Teams review student work in follow-up sessions to assess fidelity and response to the instructional strategies. Middle school teams' focus will primarily be a vertical alignment approach, as there is only one teacher per grade level & subject. District Coaches will also support these teams' work routinely. The Administrative Leadership Team observes in classrooms, providing Instructional Coaching feedback based on targeted areas of focus or learning by the teachers. Professional Development will be provided as a result of identified needs. Title 1 funds are allocated to provide materials and professional development that will directly impact classroom instruction and student learning. Magnet School Assistance Program (MSAP) funds and training are also utilized to support instruction and curriculum.

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

Rochelle hosts various high schools' information sessions with students. Eighth grade students attend the Workforce Education "WE3" expo in order to gain insight into various academies and career oriented programs available in our district. Guest speakers are utilized through content area courses and enrichment opportunities for all students. Teachers integrate real-world connections in unit lesson plans, including guest speakers, local field trips, and virtual field trips utilizing technology. {Great American Teach-In}

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math				\$143,588.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	5100	100-Salaries	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$64,137.00
			<i>Notes: Math Instructional Coach Salary</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$71,608.00
			<i>Notes: Math Interventionist Salary</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$2,033.00
			<i>Notes: Special Activity Payroll for after school math tutoring</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Math Instructional Resources</i>			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$652.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teacher salaries for LSI training days for classroom teachers</i>			
	6400	730-Dues and Fees	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$3,658.00
			<i>Notes: Conference attendance for Instructional Staff in summer 2020 at LSI conference</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA				\$89,944.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$71,424.00
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$1,800.00
			<i>Notes: ELA Instructional Resources</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$11,520.00
			<i>Notes: Leveled Literacy Intervention Kits</i>			
	6150	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$700.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies and materials for Parent Involvement Events</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional support materials for special area classes</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Periodical Subscriptions for Scholastic News, Studies Weekly - building literacy skills with Informational Text</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7800		0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00

			<i>Notes: Transportation and/or admission costs for field trips to support and enhance Science and other cross-curricular learning</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School Climate				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6150	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Agendas and communication folders</i>			
Total:						\$240,532.00