

Polk County Public Schools

# Rochelle School Of The Arts



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Carol Griffin**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2014

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>67%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>66%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	B	B

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

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

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

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

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ward, Julie	Principal	Oversee all functions of the school and the School Improvement Plan
Brackman, Lee	Assistant Principal	
Tidwell, Donna	Other	
Mayes, Kim	Instructional Coach	
Bryant, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	
Nolen, Kim	Other	
Ross, Ariel	Instructional Coach	
Whiteside, Heather	Other	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 6/15/2014, Carol Griffin

**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.*

9

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

55

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	



**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	71	71	82	84	85	83	115	94	103	0	0	0	0	788
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	3	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	1	5	6	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	2	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	9	11	12	11	12	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	22	20	17	15	0	0	0	0	89
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	9	7	10	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	55
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	0	0	6	12	15	13	7	7	0	0	0	0	60

**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	13	18	18	17	15	0	0	0	0	89

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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**

Tuesday 6/2/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	9	0	0	0	0	22

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	57	70	77	88	78	87	107	95	102	0	0	0	0	761
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	8	1	5	0	6	5	9	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	8	8	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	13	24	25	24	20	0	0	0	0	108

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	9	0	0	0	0	22

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	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	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	63%	61%	61%	58%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	58%	59%	52%	53%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	49%	54%	43%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	59%	61%	62%	57%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%	56%	59%	54%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	52%	47%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	52%	56%	52%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	79%	78%	71%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	48%	17%	58%	7%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	60%	47%	13%	56%	4%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	64%	48%	16%	54%	10%
	2018	51%	41%	10%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
07	2019	59%	42%	17%	52%	7%
	2018	49%	42%	7%	51%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	63%	48%	15%	56%	7%
	2018	56%	49%	7%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	56%	-5%	64%	-13%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	54%	51%	3%	60%	-6%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2019	48%	47%	1%	55%	-7%
	2018	47%	40%	7%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2019	60%	39%	21%	54%	6%
	2018	42%	40%	2%	54%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	38%	35%	3%	46%	-8%
	2018	49%	34%	15%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	70%	11%	71%	10%
2018	97%	84%	13%	71%	26%
Compare		-16%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%
2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	95%	41%	54%	56%	39%
Compare		5%			

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	33	41	25	29	18					
ELL	53	64		42	27						
BLK	50	52	47	48	43	41	25	65	89		
HSP	66	59	53	61	55	57	44	85	67		
MUL	63	64		56	50						
WHT	81	64	54	75	57	48	68	97	92		
FRL	55	52	45	51	46	46	28	80	78		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	48	56	4	38	40					
ELL	28	44		39	44						
BLK	41	44	49	44	50	51	28	90	86		
HSP	56	54	60	55	46	28	56				
MUL	54	39		58	65		64				
WHT	72	50	36	74	62	48	76	100	72		

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
FRL	46	43	46	50	53	48	40	95	72		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	10	21	25	10	29	30					
ELL	8	46		8	38						
BLK	45	43	34	43	44	39	31	57	53		
HSP	58	58	63	56	60	61	55	79	88		
MUL	64	55		56	45						
WHT	76	60	61	76	67	65	76	92	86		
FRL	49	46	43	47	48	40	31	68	53		

**ESSA Data**

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	51
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	58
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	71
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.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Out of School Suspension data declined significantly in the first three quarters of the 2019-20 school year, compared to the 2018-19 school year. Only 32 students received OSS as a consequence with a total of 68 days of OSS. The 2018-19 data reflected XX students with a total of XX days of OSS.

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

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

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

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

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



classrooms.

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

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

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

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

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

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** State, district, and school initiatives have been implemented with goals of improving instructional practice, student engagement, and learning achievement. Our Leadership Team recognizes inconsistencies in knowledge and implementation practices by teachers which impacts student engagement, learning, class/school climate, and achievement. At a minimum, this impacts instructional practices, teacher preparation for learning experiences, differentiation, and school culture. As FSA data from 18-19 indicated, there are significant gaps in achievement between the total population and some subgroups, notably African American students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and Students with Disabilities. Setting clear expectations for the teachers' consistent implementation and focus of evidence-based strategies and then monitoring the implementation with fidelity is critical.

**Measurable Outcome:** Formative: Monthly focus areas in two categories aligned with state, district, and/or school initiatives: (1) school/classroom climate and (2) instructional/engagement strategies.  
 Measurable outcome of 85% or more of all K-8 and Arts teachers will implement monthly focus areas as expected by the end of the month.  
 Summative: (2018-19) School Grade points of 536 (60% of available points) will increase to 563 (63% of points possible) in 2020-21.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Monitoring of teacher implementation of identified focus areas through "Walk-Throughs and Feedback" - potential correlation with student academic achievement: Affirmation (.19), Monitoring & Evaluating (.27), Focus (.24), School Culture (.25), Intellectual Stimulation with current theories and practices (.24) - Source: "School Leadership That Works" Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** When presented with professional learning, teachers are often overwhelmed at the point of implementation and practice. By identifying focus areas in two key areas (climate and instructional strategies/practices) on a monthly basis for PD, support, and monitoring, improved clarity will be gained by the administration and teachers. This will build capacity, strength, assist in identifying support needs, and will also hold administrators and teachers accountable for identified initiatives and practices set forth as school expectations.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Establish a monthly focus calendar for the year with a climate & culture focus area and an instructional strategies/practice focus area.  
 Examples for Climate: PBIS, Sanford Harmony, Emergenetics, Student Agency, Community/Parent Engagement, strategies to reduce opportunity gaps (i.e. from "Poor Students, Rich Teaching" book study), use of student agendas;  
 Examples for Instructional Strategies/Practice: Project-Based Learning, Readers Workshop, Technology Integration, LSI/Target-Task/Success Criteria, Consistent pacing and use of assessments, Differentiation/Personalized Learning (especially for ESSA subgroups)

**Person Responsible** Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)

2. Organize professional development appropriate to each grade, initiative, or subject, including teacher leaders to support other teachers. Utilize these "in-house experts" also when additional support is needed for individual teachers. The school will also incorporate the services of district or outside consultants for targeted areas of learning or growth (e.g. Readers Workshop, Emergenetics) and/or conference

attendance (e.g. Learning Sciences International) to strengthen teachers' understanding and application of skills related to standards-based, equitable learning experiences.

**Person Responsible** Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)

3. Develop a schedule for administration and instructional coaches for walk-throughs, participation in collaborative planning, and implementation rubrics to share with teachers to provide feedback on monthly focus areas.

**Person Responsible** Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)

4. Sustain and reinforce focus areas by celebrating implementation and successes through communication channels such as emails, staff newsletters, visual displays and feedback forms for teachers.

**Person Responsible** Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)

Teacher leaders will work during the summer of 2020 to assemble resources unique to focus areas to equip themselves as resources for other teachers during the school year. Notebooks with materials will be organized before the year begins and will be added to throughout the year to be an on-going resource for teacher leaders.

**Person Responsible** Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on the diverse population of our school, and a close examination of student performance across race, ethnicity, and other subgroups during the 2018-2019 school year, it is essential to develop culturally responsive educators who understand how social, economic, cultural, and systematic factors all influence the level of learning and types of access and opportunities these environments provide to our students. According to our 2018-2019 ESSA report, there were disparities with African-American and Economically Disadvantaged students, as well as Students With Disabilities. Therefore, teachers must be prepared with a thorough understanding of the various backgrounds and learning styles of the students they teach. In addition, it is necessary to strengthen our teachers' awareness of how these factors affect student learning behaviors and how that can change the dynamics in a classroom and student interactions. It is our goal to reduce existing opportunity gaps and build student agency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Formative assessments and behavioral data will be analyzed and discussed during PLCs and monthly MTSS meetings to lead teachers in making immediate decisions regarding differentiation and personalization; Culturally Responsive teaching strategies will be implemented and modeled by staff members, and monitored by administration and/or leadership team members using Walkthroughs, professional and reflective conversations, PBIS data, and discipline records.

Summative: (2018-2019) School Grade points of 536 (60% of available points) will increase to 563 (63% of possible points) in 2020-2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Using Eric Jensen's book, "Poor Students, Rich Teaching" as a staff book study, teachers will implement culturally responsive teaching strategies Increasing teachers' awareness of practices that enhance and practices that hinder student learning and growth is the first step in affecting change. This professional development will be strengthened throughout the year via variety of Arts instruction, project-based learning opportunities, Teacher and Student Agency practices, MTSS/differentiated instruction, collaboration meetings, Growth Mindset conversations, and through personalized learning opportunities.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Seeing the disparity among our student subgroups, it is imperative that we bridge the divide by equipping teachers with academic and behavioral strategies that will make our students thirsty for education. By building effective teacher-student relationships, and staff and students understanding their thinking and behavioral preferences (Emergenetics for staff and students in gr 5-8, and Sanford Harmony in K-4), common language will be developed and relationships between teachers and students will be strengthened. This will build trust with students giving students the opportunities to learn, grow, and achieve at their highest levels.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Build rapport with families and students. Teachers will communicate with parents throughout the year to strengthen the family engagement connection: to ask questions about what they need, how they can help, to share available resources at school and those available from home, and what they can expect from the teacher for the school year. Communication will occur through email & technology systems, conferences, parent information events/open house, student learning showcase events, phone calls, and agendas. Parent events on campus will vary in time-frame to provide additional opportunities for families to engage with the school.

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

2. Create a positive classroom culture that fosters an achievement mindset. When students clearly understand expectations and have predictable settings, they are more likely to experience success within different environments.

\* Utilize the S.T.O.I.C. process, (Structure the environment; Teach expectations; Observe student behavior; Interact positively-building relationships; Correct behavior errors fluently)

\* CHAMPS (Conversation level, Help, Activity, Movement, and Participation) procedures - 3 positives-1 corrective/student/day.

\*PBIS - teach expectations, reinforce through school-developed protocols in elementary and middle school

\* Refresher trainings will be provided for all staff and a more in-depth training for new staff for each area.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.net)

3. Social Emotional Learning will be addressed uniquely in elementary and middle school grades: Elementary teachers will implement Sanford Harmony daily to build a classroom climate of empathy, respect, tolerance, and compassion.

Middle school students will participate in 6-8 Panther Pride sessions during the year, focused on social emotional learning goals, such as empathy, compassion, tolerance, and respect of others. Emergenetics will also be used in grades 5-8 to develop students' understanding of their thinking and behavioral preferences and those of their peers and teachers.

**Person Responsible** Lee Brackman (lee.brackman@polk-fl.net)

4. Add resources to classroom libraries to insure the culture and diversity of the students in the classroom is represented in age-appropriate literature. Reading A-Z, Studies Weekly, and other classroom magazines will be used by teachers as a resource. Readers Workshop and Project-Based Learning experiences will include the incorporation of culturally responsive literature.

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

5. Continued analysis of District Assessments (STAR Reading and Math; Writing and Science Quarterly Assessments) of all students, with specific focus on African-American, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students w/Disabilities subgroups to monitor their progress throughout the year. Deliberate and consistent analysis of disaggregated data and continued discussions during weekly PLCs with Reading and Math Instructional Coaches about barriers, protocols, and strategies that are equitable and diverse will result in appropriate tiers of instruction being provided for all students.

**Person Responsible** Heather Whiteside (heather.whiteside@polk-fl.net)

6. ESE teachers, the reading resource teacher, and Math Interventionist will provide support for students (MTSS groups and SWD) in Math and ELA identified through data analysis and teacher identification. This will assist in closing achievement and opportunity gaps for these students. Before and after-school tutoring (extended learning) will be provided as much as possible to support students.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.net)

7. The instructional staff will engage in a book study with "Poor Students, Rich Teaching" by Eric Jensen to deepen understanding and develop skills to reach and inspire a diverse student population. Depending on the 2020-21 school calendar, the book study will occur in vertical teams of teachers, approximately 10-15 teachers per group. Teachers will develop goals and strategies to improve classroom practice.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.net)

8. Build a positive climate of academic achievement and authentic student engagement through collaborative planning with grade levels and/or departments (during planning times and through providing substitutes for extended planning sessions) and Project-Based Learning units, which will build 21st Century skills, develop student agency, create authentic learning experiences, promote risk-taking, and reduce opportunity gaps. Presentations of learning and/or exhibitions of learning will include opportunities for students to showcase and present their learning to parents and community members. Through research, working in collaborative groups, engaging with technology, and addressing driving questions that are focused on relevant topics, student motivation and integration of learning will increase.

**Person Responsible** Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Discipline data from 2018-19 reflected a heightened number of students with out of school suspensions. Data from the first three quarters of the 2019-20 year indicated a notable decline in out of school suspensions. This area will benefit from continued monitored to insure the number of students does not rise again in 2020-21, and that the data is monitored for disparities based on gender and race.**

## 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.

Rochelle's school culture starts with our core values/expectations of Respect, Safety, Active Learning, Unity and Creativity. Respect is taught to our students so they have regard for the feelings, wishes, rights, and traditions of others. Safety is discussed daily and practiced throughout the year through safe classroom and campus practices, many safety drills, as well as the regular washing of hands and the use of hand sanitizer. Active Learning is shown through student engagement in the lesson and student agency. We also use



Emergenetics to make sure we are teaching to all thinking and behavioral preferences. Rochelle is a K-8 school so Unity is taught as a sense of pride in our school, the campus and supporting and encouraging each other. As a school of the arts, the students are encouraged to show their Creativity through different art mediums.

All stakeholders are constantly made aware and reminded of our core values in meetings, assemblies, concerts, presentations of learning, exhibitions, and publications. Our school provides many opportunities for stakeholders to take part in building the positive culture. Our school utilizes a School Advisory Counsel, comprised of parents, community partners, and teachers, to assist in decisions for the school based on our mission. Regular meetings are held to update stakeholders on current and upcoming events, as well as take part in discussions regarding the direction of the school pertaining to the school vision and mission.

Through the Fine Arts department, opportunities and performances allow stakeholders to take part in creation, production, and support of varied activities in the school and community. Our school frequently invites outside community members to speak to our students regarding outside career opportunities or as content area experts/guest speakers.

Our school hosts Data Nights, where parents and students have the opportunity to meet with teachers regarding student performance, and how to enrich and engage student learning for all students. We utilize a school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support model of support for our students, designed to increase communication on school expectations to our students and parents regarding student trends in behavior. A team of student ambassadors from middle school homeroom classes meets to bring ideas and suggestions to administration to assist with creating a school culture where students and teachers come together to create positive environments. Our school also uses “Panther Pride” Days, designed to address social-emotional needs that students are facing today. Teachers are able to assist with leading discussions where students have a safe place to talk about current social or emotional issues.

**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: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems				\$260,242.96
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
5100	100-Salaries	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$208,542.96	
<i>Notes: Reading and Math Instructional Coaches and Math Interventionist</i>						
6150	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$3,800.00	
<i>Notes: Student Agendas, Communication Folders, and supplies for Parent Engagement events</i>						
6400	730-Dues and Fees	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$3,200.00	
<i>Notes: Conference attendance for teachers and administration to strengthen instructional practices</i>						
5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Other Federal		\$41,700.00	

			<i>Notes: Technology purchases (laptop cart, iPad cart, VR headsets)</i>			
	6400	311-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Other Federal		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Consultative Services for Readers Workshop</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Equity &amp; Diversity</b>				<b>\$29,216.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$9,776.00
			<i>Notes: Reading, Math, Science, and Special Area Instructional Supplies</i>			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		\$5,440.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers for curriculum planning for teachers</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Other Federal		\$14,000.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional materials &amp; supplies (Readers workshop books, culturally diverse books, display systems for learning celebrations, PBL unit materials)</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$289,458.96</b>