

Broward County Public Schools

Rock Island Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Rock Island Elementary School

2350 NW 19TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cormic Priester

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Rock Island Elementary School

2350 NW 19TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311

[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 PK-5	Yes	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Rock Island Elementary School is committed to providing students with a safe and stimulating environment, a love of learning and respect for our world through the combined efforts of faculty, staff, parents, and community. Through a love of learning, we foster a motivational environment in which students can be successful in reading, mathematics, science, technology, and writing.

This mission was the foundation that led to choosing the Transformational model for the school. This “College and Career Ready” model will promote high quality instruction aligned to Florida Standards, engagement of all stakeholders, and ongoing professional development for teachers.

This year we are placing an emphasis on increasing tier 1 teaching and learning, and closing the achievement gap through the studying and implementation of Don Lemov's text; Teach Like A Champion. The school leadership team is working with the Teacher Professional and Leadership Growth department to implement standards based instruction through high quality Tier 1 standards aligned units.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the school is grounded in the second generation of The Seven Correlates of Highly Effective Schools which serves as the guiding principles of the school's vision. The Seven Correlates of Effective School's are:

1. Climate of High Expectations
2. Positive Home and School Relations
3. Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task
4. Frequent monitoring of student progress
5. Strong instructional leadership
6. Clear and focused mission
7. Safe and orderly environment

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
Priester, Cormic	Principal	Lead the school leadership team and ensure the vision is implemented. Monitor and lead as the instructional leader ensuring high quality standards based instruction. Monitor school data to assess student, class, grade, and school-wide progress to ensure school is achieving its goals. Share decision making with leadership team to ensure student progress. Support teachers and coaches in developing their knowledge about the curriculum and promote teacher collaboration with a focus on effective classroom instruction. Engage teachers in conversations regarding class, grade, and school data, facilitate teacher reflection, mentor and train teachers.
Rumble-Wise, Marie	Assistant Principal	Support teachers in developing their knowledge about the curriculum and promote teacher collaboration with a focus on effective classroom instruction. Engage teachers in conversations regarding class, grade, and school data, facilitate teacher reflection, mentor and train teachers. Lead the school leadership team and ensure the vision is implemented. Monitor and lead as the instructional leader ensuring high quality standards based instruction. Monitor school data to assess student, class, grade, and school-wide progress to ensure school is achieving its goals. Share decision making with leadership team to ensure student progress. Ensure the vision of the principal is achieved.
Jordan, Valencia	Teacher, K-12	Lead grade level teams with delivering standards based instruction, assessing, and analyzing data for improvement. Communicates student and grade level progress with administration and support and promote the vision of the school's principal. Monitor and implement IFC and modify as needed based on assessment data with coach support.
Whittaker, Sophia	Instructional Coach	Create standards based assessments for grades K-5, assess data and determine needs, create, monitor and modify Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) based on assessment data. Participate and lead Professional Learning Communities, monitor the progress of the lowest quartile students and outline specific plans for improvement. Mentor, coach support teachers, and provide ELA professional development to build teacher pedagogy.
Juin, Norma	Administrative Support	Monitor the progress of special needs students and provide instructional strategies and support to teachers.
Stephenson, Genvieve	Administrative Support	Monitor the progress of critical needs students and lead the implementation for Social Emotional Learning (SEL). Mentor and provide support for at risk students and students who have been retained.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Cormic Priester

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.*

9

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.*

28

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	68	68	79	74	78	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	458
Attendance below 90 percent	26	30	25	31	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	4	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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 9/29/2020

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	75	91	81	92	95	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	521
Attendance below 90 percent	18	18	17	13	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	3	8	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	75	91	81	92	95	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	521
Attendance below 90 percent	18	18	17	13	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	3	8	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	37%	59%	57%	30%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	60%	58%	51%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	54%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	54%	65%	63%	43%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	66%	62%	69%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	53%	51%	70%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	27%	46%	53%	29%	45%	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	33%	60%	-27%	58%	-25%
	2018	29%	59%	-30%	57%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	62%	-14%	58%	-10%
	2018	18%	58%	-40%	56%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
05	2019	28%	59%	-31%	56%	-28%
	2018	27%	56%	-29%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	65%	-4%	62%	-1%
	2018	37%	63%	-26%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	67%	-10%	64%	-7%
	2018	44%	63%	-19%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	43%	64%	-21%	60%	-17%
	2018	40%	62%	-22%	61%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	29%	49%	-20%	53%	-24%
	2018	27%	51%	-24%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	24	48	50	29	50	47					
ELL	37	63		70	77		38				
BLK	35	52	59	51	57	47	27				
HSP	67	100		87	90						
FRL	35	56	58	53	59	44	25				
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	8	18	25	13	24	29	7				
ELL	31	45		44	50						
BLK	22	28	37	38	42	31	23				
HSP	83			83							
FRL	25	31	36	41	45	31	28				
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	2	32	38	11	46	47	17				
ELL	41	71		58	76		30				
BLK	28	49	53	41	67	69	27				
FRL	29	50	54	43	68	69	27				

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	50
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	48
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	86

Hispanic Students	
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
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.

On the 2019 ELA assessment, ELA performance showed the lowest performance with a proficiency of 37%. Factors that contributed to this performance include; tier 1 reading instruction aligned to the depth and breadth of the standard, the teachers ability to frequently progress monitor and provide on the spot feedback to revise knowledge.

55.9% of our SWD subgroup were proficient at level 1. Factors that contributed to this performance include personnel. Our current SWD teacher is a 53.5% employee.

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

Science had the greatest decline with a decrease of 1% point. Factors which contributed to this is the lack of opportunity to fully participate in hands on learning through experiments and the full integration of Science in various content areas.

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.

5th Grade Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the State average. Factors that contributed to this gap involve the majority of SWD receive support services in ELA. Math abilities as per collected data are usually higher and the priority for intensive support is usually identified as ELA. The exposure to hands on Tier 1 instruction also played a factor in the gap.

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

Math proficiency showed the most improvement. New actions that contributed to this growth included a Math Open Lab each morning focusing on fluency, contracting the services of J&J Math Boot Camp to provide supplemental Math instruction to scholars in grades 3-5, the establishment of a Math Club during Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) twice weekly, and the implementation of targeted Math interventions during the daily Math block.

ELA Learning Gains also showed the most improvement. New actions that contributed to this growth included the implementation of a common intervention hour utilizing a "walk to read" model where students receive targeted interventions in homogeneous groups.

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

Two areas of potential concern from the EWS data is attendance below 90% school-wide and the number of level 1s in Reading and Math.

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

1. ELA proficiency for SWD.
2. Math proficiency for SWD.
3. Decreasing the number of attendance below 90%.
4. Number of Level 1s in ELA.
5. Number of Level 1s in Math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA proficiency for SWD is currently below 41%. 76.5% of SWD are not proficient nor can demonstrate proficiency on grade level standards. Many of these students perform 2-3 grade levels behind which impacts learning in other content areas requiring reading.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, 45% of SWD will score a level 3 or higher on the English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cormic Priester (cormicpriester@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tier 1 instruction using aligned units, skill based instruction, and Teach Like a Champion strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This year, we continue to place an emphasis on increasing tier 1 teaching and learning, and closing the achievement gap through the studying and implementation of Don Lemov's Teach Like a Champion. The school's leadership team is working with the Teacher Professional and Leadership Growth department to implement standards based instruction through high quality tier 1 standards aligned units.

Action Steps to Implement

Children's Learning Initiative (CLI) support in grades K-3.

Person Responsible: Sophia Whittaker (sophia.whittaker@browardschools.com)

Empower School's participant using standards aligned units.

Person Responsible: Sophia Whittaker (sophia.whittaker@browardschools.com)

Weekly planning with instructional coaches on using the standards aligned units, providing feedback to students and aggressively progress monitoring instruction.

Person Responsible: Sophia Whittaker (sophia.whittaker@browardschools.com)

ESE Facilitator planning with classroom teachers to align strategies with ESE goals.

Person Responsible: Norma Juin (norma.juin@browardschools.com)

Tier II and Tier III instruction will provide students with standards based remediation during small group instruction and the common intervention hour.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math proficiency for SWD is currently below 41%. Seventy-one% of SWD are not proficient nor can demonstrate proficiency on grade level standards. Many of these students perform 2-3 grade levels behind which impact overall proficiency on grade level formative and summative assessments.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, 550% of SWD will score a level 3 or higher on the Mathematics Florida Standards Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cormic Priester (cormicpriester@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tier 1 instruction using aligned units, skill based instruction, and Teach Like a Champion strategies and the establishment of a Math intervention block. A Math lab has also been implemented for all scholars in grades 3-5 to provide hands on extension of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This year, we continue to place an emphasis on increasing tier 1 teaching and learning, and closing the achievement gap through the studying and implementation of Don Lemov's Teach Like a Champion. The school's leadership team is working with the Teacher Professional and Leadership Growth department to implement standards based instruction through high quality tier 1 standards aligned units.

Providing Math interventions will positively impact SWD who need the additional support.

Action Steps to Implement

Empower School's participant using standards aligned units.

Person Responsible Marie Rumble-Wise (marie.rumble-wise@browardschools.com)

Weekly planning with instructional coaches on using the standards aligned units, providing feedback to students and aggressively progress monitoring instruction.

Person Responsible Marie Rumble-Wise (marie.rumble-wise@browardschools.com)

ESE Facilitator planning with classroom teachers to align strategies with ESE goals.

Person Responsible Norma Juin (norma.juin@browardschools.com)

Tier II and Tier III instruction will provide students with standards based remediation through the use of Everglades Math.

Person Responsible Marie Rumble-Wise (marie.rumble-wise@browardschools.com)

The establishment of a Math intervention block outside of the Math block.

Person Responsible Marie Rumble-Wise (marie.rumble-wise@browardschools.com)

Math Acaletics implementing a Math Club for 30 minutes daily.

Person Responsible Marie Rumble-Wise (marie.rumble-wise@browardschools.com)

Math Lab each morning, 3 days weekly.

Person Responsible Marie Rumble-Wise (marie.rumble-wise@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Remaining school-wide improvement focus includes, decreasing the number of attendance below 90%, increasing the number of Level 1s in ELA and Math.

The leadership team has identified the following action steps/initiatives to increase attendance:

- 1.) Implementing an attendance plan to address increasing attendance school-wide.**
- 2.) Wake up calls are done daily for students with 90% attendance.**
- 3.) Students participate in monthly attendance celebrations as attendance improves.**

The leadership team has identified the following action steps/initiatives to decrease the number of level 1s in Reading and Math:

- 1.) Empower School's participant using standards aligned units.**
- 2.) Weekly planning with instructional coaches on using the standards aligned units, providing feedback to students and aggressively progress monitoring instruction.**
- 3.) ESE Facilitator planning with classroom teachers to align strategies with ESE goals.**
- 4.) Tier II and Tier III instruction will provide students with standards based remediation during small group instruction and the common intervention hours.**

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.

Rock Island Elementary strives to engage stakeholder in the day to day decision making. Parents are frequently recruited and invited to participate in school-based committees. Parents of scholars from all subgroups are recruited to ensure diversity. Parents, business partners, and community members serve on the School Advisory Council, the Social Emotional Learning Team, and the School-wide Positive Behavior Plan Committee.

Two Teacher Parent Conferences events are held each year. A flexible meeting schedule is provided for parents to meet with teachers between 7:30 AM and 7:00 PM, allowing parents to meet with teachers to discuss student progress and discuss next steps.

Family Nights are held each month on a variety of academic focus. Parents are oriented to grade level standards, participate in hands-on activities, and are armed with strategies to assist their child/children at home. These events serve to strengthen the home school connection and enable parents to play a greater role in their child's education.

A positive school culture is contributed to through a number of parent recognition programs. Parents are recognized through parent honor rolls each quarter. Outstanding parents are nominated by classroom teachers and are recognized and rewarded at assemblies. Business partners are also spotlighted in the monthly newsletter.

A Family Resource Night is held each year to expose parents to the social, economical, financial, emotional, language, and cultural, medical, and educational resources within the community. Business and community partners meet with parents, assist them with securing services, and forming social connections.

Parents complete a survey each year which is used to improve communication, school practices, inform and address school improvement needs.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00