Orange County Public Schools

Rosemont Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rosemont Elementary

4650 POINT LOOK OUT RD, Orlando, FL 32808

https://rosemontes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Cruz Diaz

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

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)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: D (32%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Rosemont Elementary

4650 POINT LOOK OUT RD, Orlando, FL 32808

https://rosemontes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2019-20 Title I School

Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

100%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

98%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	D	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

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
Ellis, Amanda	Principal	Dr. Ellis, principal of Rosemont Elementary is responsible for the overall functioning of the school and data for all grade levels. Dr. Ellis attends and facilitates Data/Multi-Tier Support Systems and Profession Learning Community (PLC) meetings. Dr. Ellis monitors both lesson plans and classroom instruction through observations to ensure standards based instruction and tasks are aligned to the standards. She provides actionable feedback to increase both teacher and student growth. Dr. Ellis communicates on a consistent manner with the stakeholders of the school be it parents, community members, business partners or district level staff.
Charles, Charline	Assistant Principal	In the role of Assistant Principal, Charline Charles participates in the ongoing process of progress monitoring of student achievement data. She is part of Multi-Tier Support System team working with teachers to identify strategies both academic and behavioral to meet student needs. Ms. Charles monitors the effectiveness of classroom instruction and provides actionable feedback to teachers which includes observing, coaching and evaluating. Ms. Charles attends PLC meetings and supports the instructional coaches.
Stanton, Merrill	Instructional Coach	In her role as an instructional coach, Mrs. Stanton utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in best practices for delivering standard-based instruction. She participates in grade-level professional learning communities and provides mentoring and professional development to build teacher capacity.
Poole, Tawana	Instructional Coach	In her role of reading specialist, Ms. Poole utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in best practices for delivering standard-based instruction. She participates in grade level professional learning communities and provides mentoring and professional development to build teacher capacity in the area of reading.
Dodd, Zaneta	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Dodd is the Staffing Specialist at Rosemont Elementary. She is responsible for maintaining accurate reporting and compliance of our Students with Disabilities. She is the liaison with our parents seeking support for students in our ESE programs. She facilitates meeting with parents and district staff as well as working with teachers to provide best practices and instructional strategies to meet our ESE students' needs. She is a member of the Multi-Tier Systems of Support..
Daddio, Jill	Instructional Media	Mrs. Daddio is the media specialist at Rosemont Elementary. She responsible for maintaining our school media center, literacy incentives, and she is part of the DCLT. She is the lead member in ensuring all of our new student computers and iPads are inventoried with the rollout of the one to one Digital process. She is part of Multi-Tier System of Support team working with teachers to identify strategies both academic and behavioral to meet student needs.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Talpade, Sandra	School Counselor	Ms. Talpade is the counselor at Rosemont Elementary. She provides personal and social growth counseling which includes individual and group counseling relating to academic success, understanding of self and others, communication skills, decision making, relationship skills, conflict resolution, and goal setting. Ms. Talpade provides crisis intervention services and follow-up services as appropriate.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2020, Cruz Diaz

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%)

	2017-18: D (33%)
	2016-17: D (35%)
	2015-16: D (32%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	36	86	91	88	96	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	8	15	32	23	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	15	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/20/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	17	8	18	35	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	17	8	18	35	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	57%	57%	30%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	58%	58%	37%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	53%	40%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	63%	63%	30%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	61%	62%	44%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	48%	51%	37%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	56%	53%	29%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	35%	55%	-20%	58%	-23%
	2018	33%	55%	-22%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
	2018	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
	2018	21%	55%	-34%	55%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	63%	-9%	64%	-10%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	41%	57%	-16%	60%	-19%
	2018	27%	59%	-32%	61%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
	2018	23%	53%	-30%	55%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	65	60	35	62	69	27				
ELL	35	53		45	72						
BLK	36	54	53	56	66	54	44				
HSP	41	67		66	81						
MUL	46			62							
FRL	36	56	61	57	63	47	41				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	5	17	24	8	32	35					
ELL	41	58	40	31	45	36	30				

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
BLK	26	31	33	37	40	32	21				
HSP	30	23		37	41	36	15				
MUL	31			50							
FRL	27	31	35	37	39	33	24				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD		27	33	3	35	36					
ELL	24	47	50	32	62		27				
BLK	28	34	41	28	43	38	25				
HSP	40	45	30	36	45		53				
MUL	25			36							
FRL	23	34	39	26	44	38	28				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	52
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.

The 2019 FSA data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA proficiency with a score of 38%. Though this was an overall increase of 10% from the prior year score of 28%, Rosemont's ELA score was below the district average of 57%. One contributing factor to the discrepancy in Rosemont Elementary to the district average is attributed to the high student mobility rate. This attributed to critical gaps in student learning within the phonics continuum and the reading process and made student placement in appropriate interventions and remediation challenging. Another second trend is student proficiency data indicating that 60% of students were 1 or more years below grade level upon entrance into 3rd grade, according to i-Ready Reading trend data. A cause could be attributed to student attendance below 90%, totaling 149 students in the 2018-2019 school year and 137 in the 2019-2020 school year.

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

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

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

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average is ELA proficiency with a school score of 38% when compared to the state average of 57%. Two factors that contributed to the achievement gap were a high rate of student mobility and student absenteeism rate. This impacted student achievement data due to the barriers it created for student learning within the phonics continuum and the reading process. The student attendance data indicated that 149 students had a below 90% attendance rate.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is ELA learning gains, both overall and Lowest 25th percentile. Overall gains rose from 30% to 57% and the lowest 25% gains increased from 33% to 61%. Additional support in ELA through the extra hour of daily reading with flexible, fluid grouping throughout the year was a contributing factor. Action included the continued development of teachers through collaborative planning sessions to analyze student data, created learning targets based on deconstructed Florida State Standards and planned for instructional delivery.

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

Two potential areas of concern from our EWS data are "Attendance below 90%", specifically from the second grade students moving to third. Another area of concern is "one or more suspensions" specifically from the fourth-grade students who will be moving to fifth grades this year.

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

1. ELA proficiency- 18% Less than District
2. Math proficiency- Same score as the District
3. ESE student subgroup- ELA 19% Achievement, but 65% gains
4. Student attendance rate below 90%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Rosemont increased in each data component for proficiency for the 2018-2019 school year, however, the school was still below the state and district averages. Though Rosemont was able to retain 94% of the classroom teachers for the 2020-2021 school year, 36% of those teachers have less than three years of experience teaching. In order to close the achievement gaps of the ESSA subgroups and lowest 30%, all Rosemont teachers need to further build their capacity through professional learning in the areas of differentiated whole and small group instruction across content areas. Aligning common assessment and iReadiy dialgnostics data with instructional strategies as indicated in the learning progressions and then reflecting on the effectiveness of identified strategies will improve teacher pedagogy.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Proficiency will increase by at least 7% to 45% on the Statewide ELA Florida Standards Assessment from the 2018-2019 school year. Science Proficiency will increase by at least 5% to 50% on the Statewide Science Assessment from the 2018-2019 school year. Math Proficiency will increase by at least 3% to 60% on the Statewide Math Florida Standards Assessment from the 2018-2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Rosemont's instructional team will use the backward design strategy, meaning teachers will begin planning instruction with the end in mind. The instructional leadership team will utilize common assessment data and feedback from classroom observations to measure and monitor mastery of standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Backward design will improve the alignment of assessment, curriculum, and instruction to build the capacity of teachers and increase student proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Create an assessment calendar that identifies standards to be mastered each nine week marking period.

Person Responsible	Merrill Stanton (merrill.stanton@ocps.net)

Create a focus calendar of standards that identifies the learning targets to be taught and assessed.

Person Responsible	Tawana Poole (tawana.poole@ocps.net)

Identify research-based strategies that best support learning targets.

Person Responsible	Tawana Poole (tawana.poole@ocps.net)

Conduct biweekly professional developments based on learning progressions, matching learning targets with best practices that focuses on the closing of achievement gaps.

Person Responsible	Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2018-2019 Rosemont Federal Percent of Points Index overall was 55% which is above the 41% threshold. Though all ESSA subgroups met the target, Students with disabilities had the lowest percent with 48%. In order to increase student growth and further narrow the achievement gap of our ESE and lowest 30% population, a focus on student engagement through monitoring and the systematic utilization of the MTSS process will be embedded into instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Student data will be used to monitor proficiency and learning gains. I-Ready diagnostic data will be used to set goals and measure the attainment of goals for proficiency and learning gains in reading and mathematics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Scheduled data chats with students will occur quarterly prior to the end of the marking period and will include the BOY and MOY diagnostics. Goals will be set based on 2019 MOY diagnostics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As students become aware of their data, and become more familiar with their learning gaps, they will close their achievement gap due to their understanding of their areas of growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a structure for student data chats- establish a method and frame that includes student targets and progress towards meeting those targets.

Person Responsible	Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

Schedule student data chats

Person Responsible	Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

Set proficiency and learning gain goal for individual students

Person Responsible	Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

Engage in data chats with students to track progress and differentiate support. Monitor for increases connected to student data chats.

Person Responsible	Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Use distributive leadership with social and emotional learning strategies and resources to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration. This will result in the ability of students to increase self management, responsible decision making, relationship skills, social awareness, and self-awareness that in turn support their learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Monitor, measure, and modify SELL (Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership) implementation via site team walks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charline Charles (charline.charles@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SELL (Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership) is a common language to support a school culture of social and emotional learning with all stakeholders.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SELL (Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership) are core competencies that focus on intrapersonal, interpersonal and decision making that integrates academics and social and emotional learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Examine current school climate and culture through the use of SEL tools.

Person Responsible	Charline Charles (charline.charles@ocps.net)

Establish SELL (Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership) site team.

Person Responsible	Charline Charles (charline.charles@ocps.net)

Monitor, measure and modify SELL (Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership) implementation

Person Responsible	Charline Charles (charline.charles@ocps.net)

Implement relative strategies to strengthen team dynamics.

Person Responsible	Charline Charles (charline.charles@ocps.net)

Embed SELL into lessons across content areas schoolwide.

Person Responsible	Charline Charles (charline.charles@ocps.net)

Develop and implement a plan for continuous improvement

Person Responsible	Charline Charles (charline.charles@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

The Parent and Family Engagement Plan outlines how our families can participate in various academic and informational parent events hosted by the school. Parents are encouraged to be active in their children's education through being involved in SAC, PTA, and the Addition's Volunteer Program. Events that are hosted at Rosemont Elementary include math and science night, literacy night, and other curriculum and celebratory events.

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: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				$61,909.34
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	UniSIG		$8,727.12
			Notes: Substitutes for common planning and professional development.			
	5900	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	TSSSA		$40,700.00
			Notes: Resource Teacher- to provide coaching.			
	5000	510-Supplies	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	TSSSA		$12,482.22
			Notes: Supplies for instruction			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				$15,994.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	3376	300-Purchased Services	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	TSSSA		$3,394.00
		Notes: Kagan Training				
	2110	120-Classroom Teachers	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	TSSSA		$12,600.00
		Notes: Summer Jumpstart program- Rising Kindergarten and 3rd Grade students. 2 Kindergarten teachers and 4 Third Grade teacher salaries for 10 days.				
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$15,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3336	590-Other Materials and Supplies	1271 - Rosemont Elementary	Title, I Part A		$15,000.00
		Notes: Professional development materials.				
					Total:	**$92,903.34**