

Orange County Public Schools

Rock Lake Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Rock Lake Elementary

408 N TAMPA AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

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

Demographics

Principal: Melanie Simmons

Start Date for this Principal: 8/8/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: F (26%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: D (40%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | 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 Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Rock Lake Elementary

408 N TAMPA AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 96% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | F | B |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

Objectives:

- ? High Expectations for Student Learning
- ? Student Social and Emotional Well-Being
- ? Dedicated and High-Quality Team
- ? Positive Climate and Safe Environment
- ? Efficient Operations
- ? Engaged and Invested Community

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Atkinson, Linton | Principal | A highly effective instructional leader, Dr. Atkinson leads school improvement initiatives and ensures a safe learning environment for all staff and students. This includes engaging community stakeholders and families in creating and implementing the vision for excellence leading to school success and improved student outcomes. He collaboratively engages the leadership team and oversees the systems, structures, and resources that are necessary for the effective functioning of the school. This includes hiring, supporting, and retaining high quality instructional and support personnel to support the attainment of the school goals. |
| Ludwig, Janet | Instructional Coach | Ms. Ludwig serves as the Staffing Specialist/ELL Compliance Specialist. In this role, she helps analyze data and assists with determining next steps as a member of the MTSS team. She also manages all documents in order for the school to be in compliance with ESE and ESOL regulations. The staffing specialist may work with the ESE and the ELL support staff to create appropriate schedules, conducts IEP meetings, and staffing meetings. The staffing specialist facilitates collaborative efforts between the classroom teacher, school resource personnel and the parent/s to act in making the best academic and personal decisions regarding individual students. |
| Williams, Ronald | Dean | Mr. Williams along with the discipline team enforces district and schoolwide discipline protocols to create a positive and safe learning environment where students can grow and succeed. The team monitors behavior interventions, provides teachers with professional learning, shares strategies to manage behaviors, and facilitates mentoring programs and social skills groups. |
| Thrift, Michelle | Instructional Coach | Ms. Thrift serves on the leadership team and has the primary responsibility for overseeing the successful implementation of the math and science curriculum. Her main duties include facilitating weekly common planning with grade level teams, providing guidance on lesson planning, and conducting job-embedded professional learning through modeling, coaching, and co-teaching to targeted teachers in order to improve their instructional delivery. She also enhances the school's data-driven culture by collecting, analyzing and monitoring data to drive instruction. Ms. Thrift sponsors our STEM club, serves on our Literacy Leadership Team to promote literacy schoolwide, and is responsible for assisting with the coordination of math and science tests. |
| Chambers, Shamica | Instructional Coach | Mrs. Lebron serves on the leadership team and has primary responsibility for overseeing the successful implementation of the reading and writing curriculum. Her main duties include facilitating weekly common planning with grade level teams, providing guidance on lesson planning, and conducting job-embedded professional learning through modeling, coaching, and co-teaching to targeted teachers in order to improve their instructional delivery. She monitors Tier I reading instruction and provides feedback and support to teachers and students for improvement. Mrs. Lebron uses progress monitoring data within the MTSS Framework to schedule Tier II and Tier III reading Intervention to close achievement gaps. Mrs. Lebron is an integral |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| | | part of our Literacy Leadership Team to promote literacy school wide and is also responsible for coordinating reading and writing tests. |
| Prince, Allyson | Assistant Principal | As the Assistant Principal, Mrs. Prince supports the Principal in all aspects of the school's operations. Together, they foster the success of staff and students by creating and sustaining a safe environment that values social emotional learning (SEL) and student achievement. Mrs. Prince is an instructional leader who monitors the implementation of a rigorous curriculum aligned to the Florida Standards. As a member of the MTSS team, she ensures that each student is provided the support and services needed for success. Mrs. Prince builds the capacity of academic coaches and teachers by facilitating professional learning opportunities and providing targeted, immediate feedback for improvement. She also leads the implementation of programs such as CHAMPS/Positive Behavior Intervention Services (PBIS), and the Social Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum to enhance student behavior and citizenship. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/8/2019, Melanie Simmons

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Demographic Data

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: F (26%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: D (40%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

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 | 14 | 37 | 45 | 56 | 59 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |

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 | 1 | 7 | 22 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 25% | 55% | -30% | 58% | -33% |
| | 2018 | 15% | 55% | -40% | 57% | -42% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 37% | 57% | -20% | 58% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 18% | 54% | -36% | 56% | -38% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 19% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 22% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 25% | 54% | -29% | 56% | -31% |
| | 2018 | 21% | 55% | -34% | 55% | -34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |

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

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

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 14 | | | 29 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 60 | | 62 | 90 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 54 | 59 | 48 | 76 | 74 | 32 | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 51 | 59 | 50 | 73 | 67 | 31 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | | 7 | 8 | 7 | 29 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 26 | 18 | 29 | 31 | 23 | 27 | | | | |
| FRL | 23 | 29 | 21 | 32 | 35 | 28 | 31 | | | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 9 | | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 57 | 58 | 49 | 69 | 62 | 48 | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 57 | 60 | 50 | 69 | 55 | 56 | | | | |

ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 54 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 70 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 432 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 22 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 66 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 53 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

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.

During the 2018-2019 school year, the school's lowest performance indicator was evident in ELA achievement with an overall score of 29%. Further analysis showed that students in grades 3 and 5 had a proficiency rate of 25% for each grade level. The i-Ready MOY ELA achievement data for the 2019-2020 school year showed that 21% of our 3rd grade students were on target to achieve proficiency, 14% of our 4th grade students were on target to achieve proficiency, and 27% of our incoming 5th grade students were on target to achieve proficiency. In the prior school year, 2017-2018, the lowest performance indicator was in ELA achievement as well with an overall score of 22%. Several factors can be attributed to the low performance in ELA. Students entering 3rd grade were deficient in fundamental reading skills, including comprehension skills. Additionally, teachers did not consistently deliver standards based instruction while using effective instructional strategies. Finally, the lack of consistency with providing differentiated small group instruction and utilizing the MTSS Framework with fidelity contributed to low performance in ELA.

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

There were no areas of decline from the prior school year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 3rd grade ELA, which was 33% lower than the state average. When looking at our subgroups, further analysis shows that Students With Disability (SWD), by achieving a proficiency rate of 14%, performed considerably lower than the state's average in ELA. This can be attributed to students being deficient in reading comprehension, vocabulary and reading fluency. Teachers did not consistently utilize effective instructional strategies for SWD in whole group and small group settings.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is math. In particular, the lowest 25 percentile made a 47 percentage point gain in math when compared to the previous year. This improvement can be attributed to the school-based academic coach working closely with teachers to provide rigorous standards-based instruction and providing additional support to targeted students. .

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

According to our early warning indicator data, 31% of students in grades 3-5 show attendance below 90%.

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

1. Use the MTSS process with fidelity and use data to drive instruction
2. Improve teachers' ability to deliver rigorous standards based instruction in ELA and math in a student-centered learning environment
3. Ensure students are authentically engaged in learning, utilize effective monitoring strategies, and respond with immediate corrective feedback
4. Implement a Social Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum
5. Implement a House System schoolwide to improve school culture and motivate staff and students to achieve at a higher level

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Teachers will effectively use the Multi-Tiered System of Supports Framework (MTSS), including prescriptive interventions and differentiated instruction, to increase student achievement in ELA. This was identified as a critical need because 29% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA in the 2018-2019 school year. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Student achievement in ELA will increase from 29% to 40% for students in grades 3-5 when teachers use data to drive instruction and meet students' learning needs in student-centered small group settings. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Professional development to be provided on the MTSS Framework, data tracking and progress monitoring subgroup interventions in reading. Teachers will consistently facilitate student data chats to discuss and target specific deficiencies and celebrate progress in reading. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The data shows that 29% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA in 2018-2019. Students performed 28% lower than the district average in ELA. Many teachers are fairly new to Rock Lake Elementary and will need to be trained on how to effectively provide and track core instruction and prescriptive interventions that will close the achievement gap. This strategy will allow us to be more responsive to our subgroup population and provide differentiated instruction as we identify, engage, and monitor them more closely leading to an improvement in student scores. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. The leadership team will utilize the MTSS Framework to provide prescriptive Tier II and Tier III interventions based on student needs.
2. The leadership team will monitor interventions, including extra-hour of instruction, by providing immediate feedback and coaching.
3. The leadership team will actively monitor instruction and provide supports to subgroups (ESE, ELL, SWD, lowest 25% students).
4. The leadership team will provide training opportunities for improving teachers' ability to teach literacy in whole group and small groups. Standards-based instruction, intervention personnel, resources and programs will be monitored for effective implementation and results.
5. The leadership team will provide frequent communication to parents regarding MTSS and students' progress. Parents will participate in student-led data chats and monthly parent meetings. They will engage in workshops and receive literacy resources to use at home.

Person Responsible Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Teachers will deliver rigorous standards-based instruction utilizing critical thinking and effective pedagogical strategies, focusing on authentic student engagement and active monitoring for student comprehension to improve student achievement in ELA, math and science. It was identified as a critical need as only 29% of our students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA, 49% were proficient in math, and 32% proficient in science in the 2018-2019 school year. |
| Measurable Outcome: | ELA proficiency will increase from 29% to 40%, math proficiency will increase from 49% to 55%, and science proficiency will increase from 32% to 40% for students in grades 3-5 when teachers deliver high quality, rigorous standards-based instruction, and engage students with authentic learning. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers will receive ongoing job-embedded professional development focused on standards-based instruction, critical thinking and effective pedagogical strategies to ensure students are authentically engaged and actively monitored to improve student achievement in ELA, math and science. Focusing on purposeful lesson delivery and honing in on authentic student engagement with monitoring techniques ensure that students are making contextual connections in ELA, math, and science to deepen their understanding. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Students performed 28% lower than the district average of 57% in ELA with 29% of students in grades 3-5 scoring on-grade level proficiency. Students performed 14% lower than the district average of 63% in math with 49% scoring on-grade level proficiency. Students performed 24% lower than the district average of 56% in science with 32% scoring on-grade level proficiency. There are many new teachers at Rock Lake and differentiated professional development will be focused on standards-based instruction, critical thinking, effective pedagogical strategies, authentic student engagement and active monitoring for student comprehension. When teachers increase their knowledge and practice in these areas, students will improve in academic performance. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will receive ongoing job-embedded professional development focused on rigorous standards-based instruction, critical thinking and effective pedagogical strategies to improve teacher pedagogy in ELA, math, and science.
2. The leadership team will analyze and monitor student progress monitoring data, student work samples, classroom walkthrough data, as well as discipline and attendance data weekly to make instructional adjustments.
3. The leadership team will monitor weekly common planning sessions in ELA, math, and science with an intense focus on standards-based instruction, effective pedagogical strategies, authentic student engagement activities, and active monitoring for student comprehension.
4. The leadership team will monitor to ensure that targeted students in grades 3-5 are enrolled in after-school tutoring for ELA, math, and science. Teachers will implement rigorous standards-based instruction as well as utilize effective pedagogical strategies.

Person Responsible Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Rock Lake Elementary will improve its school culture, climate and student discipline by implementing a social and emotional learning (SEL) curriculum to actively establish and maintain positive relationships, show empathy for others, and create a safe and trustworthy learning environment for all. It was identified as a critical need because 29% of students were proficient in ELA, 32% were proficient in Science and 49% were proficient in Math during the 2018-2019 school year. These proficiency rates are below the state averages and will improve when students and staff effectively utilize Social Emotional Learning strategies to build a more motivated and positive school culture.

Measurable Outcome:

When students are motivated to practice great citizenship, student achievement will increase from 29% to 40% in ELA, 32% to 40% in Science, and 49% to 55% in Math. Student discipline infractions will decrease by 20% in comparison to the previous school year. All staff will utilize the House System to create a safer and more positive learning environment by collaborating and interacting more respectfully in common planning, staff meetings and school events.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

A social and emotional learning curriculum identifies a few critical school-wide policies and practices to focus on such as building positive relationships where students and adults learn to understand and manage emotions, set goals, show empathy for others, and make responsible decisions. Implementing this curriculum will improve the school culture, climate and student discipline leading to improved student outcomes. The House System, to be revised for the new school year, is a schoolwide friendly competition that will promote respect and hold students and staff to a higher expectation for academic results, behavior and citizenship. Parents and community partners will participate in the House System. When stakeholders are welcomed as active participants of school life, they have an increased commitment to the school's goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Rock Lake Elementary identified poor attendance and lack of motivation as contributing factors to low academic achievement particularly in the area of reading proficiency. Implementing a Social Emotional Learning curriculum along with CHAMPS/PBIS behavior management will help to create a positive school culture through the use of proactive strategies that teach and reinforce positive behaviors. Students will be more focused on goal setting, learning and working cooperatively and collaboratively in the classroom resulting in increased academic achievement. In addition, using the house system to award points to staff and students for displaying positive behaviors will build a greater sense of community and friendly competition.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students and staff will be placed in one of four houses. Each house will represent a positive character trait. Students and staff will compete monthly to be the winning house by displaying great academic effort, behavior and citizenship. Community partners and parents will gain points for their houses by participating in school events and demonstrating school spirit.
2. The support services team will monitor discipline and attendance and provide wrap-around services to students where needed.
3. Administration will implement a SEL curriculum and provide professional development on embedding SEL strategies in lessons and staff meetings. Guidance counselor will conduct class sessions teaching positive behaviors. Student House leaders will also receive leadership training.
4. The administration will implement CHAMPS/PBIS behavior management and reward system. The dean

will reward students of the month with a celebratory party. Teachers who implement CHAMPS/PBIS effectively will be given a CHAMPS/PBIS certificate.

Person Responsible Linton Atkinson (linton.atkinson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

A school improvement goal is to improve attendance rate from 90% to 96% for 2020-2021 in grades 4-5. This was identified as a critical area of need as 30% of students in grades 4-5 show attendance below 90% which significantly impacts their learning. This will be addressed with our house system of points awarded to students based on several criteria which includes attendance. Our support services team will also be more proactive in addressing this through our school-wide social and emotional learning curriculum where we will strive to improve relationships with the parents and students so that they have a better understanding of the goals and expectations for successful academic performance.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our School Improvement Plan, created with input from all our stakeholders, identifies key proficiency targets for our students and teachers to be successful and fosters continuous learning and improvement using data. Rock Lake Elementary is committed to working with all stakeholders to create a positive culture and environment.

It starts daily with our student safety patrols and staff welcoming students on their arrival in the mornings after which they have a healthy breakfast before going to classes. Teachers stand at their doors to welcome students in the classroom and classroom rules are reviewed and reinforced throughout the day that align with the schoolwide values, guidelines, and expectations. Lesson activities include collaboration and cooperation among students where they learn to value and respect each other's ideas, and promote positive interactions.

Teachers use data to identify targeted students and pull small groups to ensure learning needs are met. Subgroups, such as lowest 30%, ELL and ESE students, are given additional support to ensure improved performance. Students who are reading on grade level participate in enrichment activities. The school

utilizes a house system where all students compete for points and monthly prizes are awarded to the house with the most points. Students are naturally competitive and enjoy earning points and competing for prizes.

Staff and teachers participate in several professional learning sessions such as CHAMPS behavior management which reinforces high expectations for students behavior and PBIS intervention strategies which rewards positive behaviors. Additionally, Social Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies are shared throughout the year and teachers embed SEL strategies in lessons to promote relationship building, responsible decision making, self-awareness and self-control. In addition, our guidance counselor and dean meet with groups of students to teach social skills and leadership skills.

Our Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) works with administration to create a welcoming environment for parents and build strong relationships within the community. This includes increasing parent and community engagement in monthly school meetings, tracking and rewarding student performances, and promoting curriculum events on campus designed to build a stronger home-school connection. The PEL will also send out a monthly newsletter with tips that give parents strategies to support their children.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | | | | \$95,351.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6000 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0641 - Rock Lake Elementary | TSSSA | 0.5 | \$24,857.00 |
| <i>Notes: Interventionist to support the lowest 30%.</i> | | | | | | |
| | 5900 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0641 - Rock Lake Elementary | Title, I Part A | 3.0 | \$20,780.00 |
| <i>Notes: Tutoring services for students in ELA and Math small groups.</i> | | | | | | |
| | 6000 | 100-Salaries | 0641 - Rock Lake Elementary | TSSSA | 1.0 | \$49,714.00 |
| <i>Notes: Resource Teacher to provide coaching support to teachers and conduct small group targeted teaching based on MTSS Framework outcomes and data.</i> | | | | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | | | \$94,763.73 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6300 | 100-Salaries | 0641 - Rock Lake Elementary | General Fund | 1.0 | \$74,869.83 |
| <i>Notes: Academic Coach to provide coaching on standards and engagements strategies via weekly common planning.</i> | | | | | | |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0641 - Rock Lake Elementary | General Fund | | \$19,893.90 |
| <i>Notes: Staff training on deconstructing standards, engagement and monitoring of understanding.</i> | | | | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | \$78,198.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6120 | 100-Salaries | 0641 - Rock Lake Elementary | General Fund | 1.0 | \$74,892.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|--|---------------------|
| | | | <i>Notes: Guidance Counselor to provide social, emotional learning classes for students and strategies for staff.</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0641 - Rock Lake Elementary | Title, I Part A | | \$3,306.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Support for parents to get involved with the House System at the school. This will help to strengthen safety for students and build community.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$288,312.73 |