

Marion County Public Schools

Romeo Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Houle

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

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 KG-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	53%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission at Romeo Elementary is to support the Marion County Public School system in developing successful citizens. Romeo Elementary will provide all students with the opportunity to achieve their personal best, to build good character, to learn respect for themselves and others, to accept responsibility for their actions, while developing a love of learning as they become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Romeo Elementary provides all children with the opportunity to explore and develop to their fullest potential.

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

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

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/14/2019, Jennifer Houle

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.*

4

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	125	121	143	100	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	970	1695
Attendance below 90 percent	28	29	17	21	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	8	10	13	2	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	46	18	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	39	26	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	11	16	25	21	10	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	1	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/13/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	11	16	25	21	10	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	11	16	25	21	10	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	47%	57%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	58%	50%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	53%	40%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	51%	63%	50%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	58%	62%	40%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	49%	51%	27%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	47%	53%	37%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	43%	44%	-1%	58%	-15%
	2018	42%	46%	-4%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	49%	3%	58%	-6%
	2018	39%	43%	-4%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	56%	-6%
	2018	52%	46%	6%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	44%	2%	53%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	61	61	29	74	72	16				
ELL	39	59	52	46	54	55	35				
BLK	57			69							
HSP	42	57	52	48	53	59	38				
MUL	68			83							
WHT	53	61	46	57	69	75	55				
FRL	45	57	46	50	59	63	41				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	30	35	15	43	44	27				
ELL	21	33	39	37	33	32	17				
BLK	33	40		25	20						
HSP	38	48	35	49	39	28	48				
MUL	63			56							
WHT	50	43	38	53	43	42	60				
FRL	41	45	36	47	39	33	48				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	26	54	63	23	43	29	21				
ELL	21	28	38	38	19	14	6				
BLK	44	50		40	45						
HSP	37	43	38	48	32	13	19				
MUL	60			50							
WHT	59	58	45	52	44	32	54				
FRL	45	49	42	46	39	24	31				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	63
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	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	76
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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.

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

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

Science Achievement was the area which demonstrated the greatest decline from the previous year. Factors contributing to this decline were lack of science based inquiry lessons. More hands on

science inquiry lessons using the 5E approach will be implemented with fidelity this year. A dedicated science lab will make this goal easier for teachers to attain.

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

Math Achievement in 3rd & 4th Grade are the areas demonstrating the greatest gap when compared to the state average. These areas are showing positive growth at our school. Many of our students are 1 or 2 grade levels behind. They are making steady learning gains, but are still not proficient on grade level material. Our teachers will focus on incorporating ongoing, formative assessment. Standards based teaching and reteaching will be aimed directly at the needs of the individual students.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Tier 1 Instruction: Student discourse & questioning Student achievement in math will increase 3% as measured by proficiency data on the FSA Reading and Math Assessment. Students in grades K-2 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase as measured by FSA..
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers incorporate more student discourse and higher order questions in their instruction then student achievement on FSA in both Reading and Math will increase by 3% across grade levels in both content areas. Students in grades K-2 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in math in i Ready. 3rd Grade: ELA from 43% to 46% MA from 50% to 53% 4th Grade: ELA from 52% to 55% MA from 65% to 70% 5th Grade: ELA from 50% to 53% MA from 44% to 47%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices point to the development of lessons using standards aligned content with the appropriate level of rigor and the employment of high impact instructional strategies. The focus of our work will center around strategies outlined by both Hattie and Marzano.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Romeo Elementary student proficiency and learning gains in reading and math on the FSA over the past 2 years indicate that continued development and focus on Tier 1 instruction are necessary to continue the positive trends in achievement and academic growth demonstrated by our student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in monthly PLC focusing on student discourse and higher order questions.

Person Responsible Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Book Study, "The Fundamental 5" for teachers new to MCPS/ Romeo

Person Responsible Susan Williams (susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Weekly math and/or reading collaborative planning

Person Responsible Stacie Crowder (stacie.crowder@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Reading Interventions that are both research based and based on individual student needs

Person Responsible Susan Williams (susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Tier 1 Instruction: Standards Based Planning and Assessment
Student achievement in math will increase 3% as measured by proficiency data on the FSA Reading and Math Assessment. Students in grades K-2 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in math from AP1 to AP3 in i Ready.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers use formative assessment to plan and deliver Florida Standards aligned instruction in Reading and Math, then student achievement on FSA in both Reading and Math will increase 3% as measured by proficiency data on the FSA Reading and Math Assessment. Students in grades K-2 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in math from AP1 to AP3 in i Ready.

3rd Grade: ELA from 43% to 46% MA from 50% to 53%
4th Grade: ELA from 52% to 55% MA from 65% to 70%
5th Grade: ELA from 50% to 53% MA from 44% to 47%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices point to the development of lessons using standards aligned content with the appropriate level of rigor and the employment of high impact instructional strategies. The focus of our work will center around strategies outlined by both Hattie and Marzano.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Romeo Elementary student proficiency and learning gains in reading and math on the FSA over the past 2 years indicate that continued development and focus on Tier 1 instruction are necessary to continue the positive trends in achievement and academic growth demonstrated by our student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in monthly PLC focusing on student discourse and higher order questions.

Person Responsible: Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Book Study, "The Fundamental 5" for teachers new to MCPS/ Romeo

Person Responsible: Susan Williams (susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Weekly math and/or reading collaborative planning SC

Person Responsible: Stacie Crowder (stacie.crowder@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Reading Interventions that are both research based and based on individual student needs

Person Responsible: Susan Williams (susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus	Home-School Partnership
Description and Rationale:	All students in grades K-5 will show an increase in reading and math achievement as measured by a 5% increase of students performing on grade level in reading and math from AP1 to AP3 in i Ready.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>If we provide parents and families capacity building strategies that address and promote positive home environments, then students will arrive at school with capacity to learn as demonstrated by a 3% increase in student achievement on FSA (grades 3-5) and 5% increase of students (grades K-2) performing on grade level in reading and math from AP1 to AP3 in i Ready.</p> <p>3rd Grade: ELA from 43% to 46% MA from 50% to 53% 4th Grade: ELA from 52% to 55% MA from 65% to 70% 5th Grade: ELA from 50% to 53% MA from 44% to 47%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Williams (susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of a family school framework which fosters 2 way communication and cooperation between schools and families. Initial implementation will utilize the Family-School Partnership template outlined at http://www.familyschool.org .
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research demonstrates that effective schools have high levels of parental and community involvement. This involvement is strongly related to improved student learning, attendance and behaviour. Family involvement can have a major impact on student learning, regardless of the social or cultural background of the family.

Action Steps to Implement

Class Dojo messages to parents bi-weekly

Person Responsible Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing Skylert Messages and Newsletters

Person Responsible Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)

Facilitation of Parent and Family Engagement Plan

Person Responsible Susan Williams (susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)

Daily announcements link to parents daily Dojo

Person Responsible Michael McClain (michael.mcclain@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance will be targeted by the leadership team. Student mentors will be assigned and frequent, personal contact will be made with families. Relationships between students and staff are a key factor in improving attendance. We will focus heavily on fostering positive relationships with students and families pre-k through 5th grade.

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.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

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: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00