# W. H. Rhodes Elementary School

# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# W. H. Rhodes Elementary School

### 5563 BYROM ST, Milton, FL 32570

### http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/whre/

## Demographics

## Principal: Kacie Reaves

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 79% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Rachel Heide |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/8/2020.

## 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.](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

# W. H. Rhodes Elementary School

## 5563 BYROM ST, Milton, FL 32570

## http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/whre/

## 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 | 73% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 37% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/8/2020.

## 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.**

Meeting the needs of each individual student by working together with families and the community.

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

To help children develop the learning skills necessary for continual improvement as responsible, productive members of the community.

## School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Reaves, Kacie | Principal | Mrs. Reaves is the school principal. Her duties and job responsibilities include the following:<br>*Manage and administer the overall activities of assessing and developing the instructional program at the<br>school.<br>*Develop and maintain positive school/community relations and act as liaison between the two.<br>*Is proactive in decisions relating to the school and community well-being. |
| Stone, Denise | Instructional Media | *Organizes and implements and open concept media program which fully supports the educational goals<br>and objectives of the school.<br>*Supports curriculum through cooperative planning and consultation with faculty and administration.<br>*Teaches lessons with specific objectives defined by and in cooperation of individual teachers. |
| Hancock, Heidi | Instructional Coach | *Responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing professional development in the areas of literacy<br>based on formal and informal assessment data.<br>*Works with school's leadership team, data team, and literacy leadership team to determine the school's<br>strengths and need for improvement in the area of literacy. |
| Worthington, Kristi | Teacher, ESE | Mrs. Worthington is an intervention teacher. Her job duties and responsibilities include the following:<br>*Supports classroom teachers for the purpose of assisting them in the implementation of established<br>curriculum and or Individual student plans.<br>* Collaborates with instructional staff, other school personnel, parents and a variety of community resources<br>for the purpose of improving the overall quality of student outcomes.<br>*Collaborates with other professional and support personnel in the delivery of multi-system support<br>for teachers and students. |
| Blackwell, Amy | Teacher, ESE | Mrs. Blackwell is an academic intervention specialist. Her job duties and responsibilities include the following:<br>*Provides information training, and support for families and educators.<br>*Promotes family involvement in education through partners between schools, parents, other organizations,<br>agencies, parent centers, and community based-family partners.<br>*Collaborates with other professional reading and support personnel in the delivery of multi-system support<br>for teachers and students. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Larson, Cindy | Teacher, K-12 | Mrs. Larson is an academic intervention specialist. Her job duties and responsibilities include the following:<br>*Provides information training, and support for families and educators.<br>*Promotes family involvement in education through partners between schools, parents, other organizations,<br>agencies, parent centers, and community based-family partners.<br>*Collaborates with other professional reading and support personnel in the delivery of multi-system support<br>for teachers and students. |
| Lay, Klinton | Assistant Principal | Mr. Lay is the assistant principal. His duties and responsibilities include the following:<br>*Assist the Principal in planning and implementing the school improvement program.<br>* Coordinate all aspects of elementary curriculum.<br>* Recommend curriculum adjustments to meet the special learning needs of individual children. |
| Douvres, Laura | Other | Behavior Coach-<br>* Collaborates with school leadership to develop and implement/maintain a school wide positive behavior support system to address the needs of all students.<br>*Work directly with students in Tier II and Tier III for behavior and their parents to modify behaviors to reach successful outcomes. |
| Roberts, Tamara | School Counselor | Mrs. Tammy Roberts is the school guidance counselor. Her job duties and responsibilities include the following:<br>* Provides appropriate consultation and staff development to school personnel, as needed.<br>*Consults and collaborates with teachers, staff and parents in understanding and meeting the needs of students.<br>*Assists with referrals to other service providers and outside agencies. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Saturday 8/1/2020, Kacie Reaves

**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**
60

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 79% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (56%)<br><br>2017-18: C (53%)<br><br>2016-17: B (55%)<br><br>2015-16: C (48%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Rachel Heide](#) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). | |

## Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 103 | 135 | 118 | 127 | 121 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 714 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/2/2020

## 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 | 147 | 152 | 156 | 152 | 123 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 867 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 6 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 147 | 152 | 156 | 152 | 123 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 867 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 6 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## 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 | 55% | 68% | 57% | 55% | 68% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 64% | 58% | 60% | 60% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 56% | 53% | 48% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 62% | 72% | 63% | 65% | 73% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 66% | 67% | 62% | 60% | 59% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 52% | 51% | 49% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 51% | 65% | 53% | 46% | 61% | 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 | 63% | 71% | -8% | 58% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 66% | -13% | 57% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 41% | 66% | -25% | 58% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 66% | -26% | 56% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 57% | 69% | -12% | 56% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 64% | -3% | 55% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 17% | | | | |

### MATH

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 03 | 2019 | 58% | 71% | -13% | 62% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 73% | -13% | 62% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 61% | 73% | -12% | 64% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 74% | -23% | 62% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 63% | 71% | -8% | 60% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 70% | -2% | 61% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | |

### SCIENCE

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 05 | 2019 | 47% | 65% | -18% | 53% | -6% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 62% | 66% | -4% | 55% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -15% | | | | | |
| 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 | 29 | 49 | 55 | 40 | 41 | 36 | 22 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 40 | | 42 | 48 | 29 | 11 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 60 | | 73 | 67 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | 65 | 75 | 57 | 58 | 60 | 47 | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 56 | 47 | 67 | 70 | 53 | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 58 | 54 | 57 | 64 | 49 | 43 | | | | |

### 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 | 20 | 34 | 34 | 38 | 41 | 39 | 21 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 49 | 42 | 53 | 47 | 23 | 37 | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 50 | | 62 | 50 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 53 | 54 | 65 | 65 | 45 | 60 | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 49 | 33 | 62 | 60 | 50 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 48 | 42 | 58 | 57 | 44 | 58 | | | | |

### 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 | 16 | 46 | 47 | 35 | 40 | 39 | 4 | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 48 | 45 | 47 | 43 | 33 | 11 | | | | |
| HSP | 80 | 82 | | 65 | 73 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 51 | 48 | | 66 | 71 | 60 | 55 | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 65 | 47 | 70 | 62 | 54 | 51 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 56 | 48 | 61 | 56 | 45 | 41 | | | | |

## 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 | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 390 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 34 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 63 |
| 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 | 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 | 54 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

### Analysis

**Data Reflection**
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The area that performed the lowest was the Lowest 25% in Math, which was 48% proficiency. A majority of the students in our lowest 25% are SWDs. Even though the lowest 25% showed the lowest performance, our overall math achievement is historically higher than ELA. Our interventions, which have included after school tutoring and a common intervention block, have predominantly focused on increasing ELA proficiency.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a difference of 12%. The science scores fell from 63% in 2018 to 51% in 2019. Several factors contributed to the decline, such as 3 out of 6 teachers on the grade level were new to the school. In addition, 2019 was year one of a new science curriculum. Also, the 2019 FCAT Science test was new.

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

The area with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the Lowest 25% in Math. Rhodes has 48% proficiency, and the state average was 51%. A majority of the students in our lowest 25% are SWDs. Our interventions, which included after school tutoring and common intervention blocks, predominantly focused on increasing ELA proficiency.

In 2018, the greatest gap was ELA-Lowest 25%. Rhodes had 40% proficiency, and the state average was 48%. The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the district average was ELA proficiency. The school average for 2018-2019 school year was 55%, and the district average was 68%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA-Lowest 25%. The lowest 25% in 2018 was 40%, and the lowest 25% in 2019 was 52%, with an increase of 12%. We offered two nine week sessions of after school tutoring focusing on reading. The school wide goal was to increase ELA learning gains. Every grade level developed a goal focused on increasing reading scores, teachers developed a goal related to the grade level goal, and they disseminated that goal to the students. Students worked to achieve personal reading goals that supported the school wide goal.

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

Attendance is a potential area of concern because 164 students had attendance rates below 90%. Another area of concern is course failure. 75 students failed either ELA, Math, or both subjects.

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

1. Increase 5th grade science proficiency.
2. Increase Math-Lowest 25% proficiency.
3. Increase ELA proficiency.
4. Increase SWDs and Black/African American proficiency.
5. Increase attendance rates.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

## #1. Other specifically relating to Supplemental Curriculum-Science

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on our 2019, our students scored 51%. Our science achievement scores were 63% in 2018. Our science scores decreased by 12% from 2018 to 2019. Also, our science scores were much lower than the district average. Our score was 51% and the district average was 65%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Science will increase proficiency from 51% in 2018-2019 to 60% in 2020-2021. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Purchase supplemental science curriculum, Science Studies Weekly, to ensure all science standards assessed are covered during instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The SSS science assessment covers third, fourth, and fifth grade science standards. The supplemental science curriculum we are purchasing will provide students with a spiral review of all standards that are assessed. This curriculum will be used to supplement the fifth grade core curriculum. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchase supplemental curriculum
2. Our fifth grade teachers will work as a collaborative team to develop lesson plans that cover the standards.
3. We will purchase leveled informational science text for all grade levels to utilize during reading and science instruction.
4. The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor benchmark science data and grades.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on 2018-2019 data, our lowest 25% is not making adequate growth in math, as compared to the state average. Our lowest 25% scored 48% and the state average was 51%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our objective is for all students to meet growth expectations, specifically focusing on our lowest 25% subgroup. The learning gains of the lowest 25% in math will increase from 48% in the 2018-2019 school year to 51% in 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | To increase the ability to individualize instruction and enhanced progress monitoring, we will purchase a research based instructional software, I-Ready Math, to supplement the core math curriculum. We will also provide professional development for this program as well as effective math strategies. In addition, identified students will receive math intervention, such as small group differentiated instruction and after school- tutoring in the spring (if COVID restrictions allow). |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The teachers need professional development to implement the curriculum with fidelity. Identified students should receive intervention outside the 60 minute math block to improve proficiency. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide math professional development.
2. Provide math intervention to identified students.
3. Purchase supplemental math materials to differentiated math instruction (I-Ready).
4. Review I-Ready data and benchmark assessments at monthly leadership team meetings and grade level meetings.
5. The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor students who are not making adequate progress.
6. Provide extended day services to identified students in the spring (if COVID restrictions allow).

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based upon the 2018-2019 data, our ELA overall proficiency is not making adequate growth as compared to other schools in Santa Rosa County. Our ELA proficiency was 55% and the district average was 68%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our objective is for all students to meet growth expectations. The overall ELA proficiency will increase from 55% during the 2018-2019 school year to 60% during the 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will receive professional development on effective teaching strategies focusing on the 90 minute uninterrupted reading block. All students will receive reading intervention or enhancement. After school reading tutoring will be offered to identified students in the spring (if COVID restrictions allow). Supplemental reading materials (Fast ForWord, Renaissance products, Phonics for Reading, Lively Letters, Imagine Learning) will be purchased to enhance the reading curriculum and provide differentiated instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The core reading curriculum should be implemented with fidelity. Students who qualify for intervention will receive interventions based on data to increase reading proficiency. Students read at different levels; therefore, supplemental reading materials will be purchased to differentiate instruction. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide ELA professional development.
2. Provide reading intervention or enrichment to all students.
3. Purchase supplemental reading materials, as listed.
4. Review Imagine Learning and benchmark assessment data during grade level and leadership team meetings.
5. The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor students who are not making adequate progress.
6. The Literacy Team will monitor school wide data for growth.
7. The Literacy Coach will provide intensive coaching for all teachers, based on need.

**Person Responsible**   Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

| | |
|---|---|
| **#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Rhodes Elementary has a large SWD subgroup. Our SWD ELA and math proficiency percentages are historically lower than other subgroups. During the 2018-2019 school year our SWD proficiency rate was at 39%, which is below the national index of 41%. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our objective is for all our SWDs to meet growth expectations. The overall proficiency of SWDs will increase from 39% in 2018-2019 school year to 42% in the 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Inclusion teams will attend ESE professional development on effective teaching strategies for students with disabilities. Student with disabilities will receive on grade level instruction in core subjects. In addition to on grade level instruction, students with disabilities will receive intensive intervention in areas of weakness, as identified by assessments. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | ESE inclusion teachers will use best practices for teaching students with disabilities. Students that are performing below grade level will receive on grade level core instruction in addition to intensive intervention to aid in closing learning gaps. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide ESE inclusion teams with professional development related to teaching students with disabilities.
2. Provide ESE inclusion teams with professional development of core curriculum.
3. Provide intensive intervention to students with disabilites.
4. Review data, such as grades, Imagine Learning and I-Ready data, and district benchmark assessments, to monitor progress of students in this subgroup.
5. The MTSS Leadership Team will montior students who are not making adequate progress.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our African American ELA and Math proficiency percentages are historically lower than our other subgroups. During the 2018-2019 school year our African American proficiency rate was 34%, which is below the national index of 41%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our objective is for all of our African American students to meet growth expectations. The overall proficiency of of African American students will increase from 34% in 2018-2019 to 41% in the 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will receive professional development related to diversity in culture and academics. Our African American students will receive on grade level instruction in core subjects. In addition to on grade level instruction, our African American student will receive intervention or enrichment, based on needs identified by data. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | All teachers need to use best practices for teaching diverse populations. Below grade level students should receive both on grade level instruction and intensive interventions to aid in closing learning gaps. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide teachers with professional development related to teaching diverse populations.
2. Provide teachers with professional development on core curriculum.
3. Provide intensive intervention to identified African American students.
4. Review data, such as grades, Imagine Learning and I-Ready reports and district benchmark assessments, to monitor progress.
5. The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor students who are not making adequate progress.

**Person Responsible**  Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

| #6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Attendance is a potential area of concern because, in 2018-2019, 164 students had an attendance rate below 90%. Good patterns of attendance improve student achievement. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | During the 2018-2019 school year 164 students had an attendance rate below 90%. Our objective is to decrease the number of students who have an attendance rate below 90% from 164 to 154 students. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We will follow the district attendance plan. We will run monthly attendance reports to monitor student attendance. We will distribute absence letters and schedule attendance meetings. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Good attendance improves the probability of a student graduating high school. Good attendance patterns begin in elementary school. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Run attendance reports monthly.
2. Distribute attendance letters to parents of students with attendance concerns.
3. Invite parents of students who have 5 unexcused absences within 30 days OR 10 unexcused absences within 90 days to attendance improvement meetings.
4. The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor attendance quarterly.

| **Person Responsible** | Kacie Reaves (reavesk@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**W. H. Rhodes Elementary School has one of the highest percentages of students living at or below poverty in Santa Rosa County. This average is typically around 80% and has underlying effects in all subgroups and across all curriculum. During the 2020-2021 school year, the school leadership team will lead the faculty in a book study, Poor Students, Rich Teaching, to address mindsets shifts necessary for bringing about positive change and academic achievement for this population.**

# Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

The families represented at W.H. Elementary School have many opportunities to be involved in the planning, review, and improvement of instruction, the Title I Program, and aspects of our school that have an impact on the school culture and climate. We have an active PTO and School Advisory Council that provides stakeholders the platform to be involved in school improvement related decisions. The goal of our various family engagement events is to establish a partnership with families in the educational process and provide them with strategies and resources to help their child at home with grade level standards and requirements. Families are asked to complete surveys at the conclusion of these events to help the school faculty and administration reflect upon the strengths and weaknesses of these events and our effectiveness at creating productive and positive family partnerships. At the end of the school year, our families are asked to complete a satisfaction survey. Administration carefully reviews the results of this survey for future planning.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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