

Orange County Public Schools

Rock Lake Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Rock Lake Elementary

408 N TAMPA AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

<https://rocklakees.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Melanie Simmons

Start Date for this Principal: 3/26/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: F (26%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Rock Lake Elementary

408 N TAMPA AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

<https://rocklakees.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	F

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

Objectives:

High Expectations for Student Learning
Student Social and Emotional Well-Being
Dedicated and High-Quality Team
Positive Climate and Safe Environment
Efficient Operations
Engaged and Invested 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Simmons, Melanie	Principal	A highly effective instructional leader, Melanie Simmons leads school improvement initiatives and ensures a safe learning environment for all staff and students. This includes creating a data-driven culture of excellence, as well as effectively managing and monitoring the teaching process to ensure high quality instruction is taking place to support the attainment of the school goals. She oversees the implementation of the MTSS framework and regularly reviews new data to successfully accomplish the desired outcomes. The Principal collaboratively engages with district and community members to facilitate the use of resources that directly supports the learning environment and impact student achievement.
Prince, Allyson	Assistant Principal	As the Assistant Principal, Mrs. Prince supports the Principal in all aspects of the school's operations. This includes fostering the success of staff and students by creating and sustaining a safe environment that values social emotional learning (SEL) and student achievement. One of her primary functions as an instructional leader is to monitor the implementation of a rigorous curriculum aligned to the Florida Standards leading to improved academic outcomes as well as school and student success. Mrs. Prince builds the capacity of academic coaches and teachers by facilitating professional learning opportunities and providing targeted immediate feedback for improvement. As a member of the MTSS team, she ensures that each student is provided the required supports and services needed for success. She also leads the implementation of programs such as CHAMPS, and the Social Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum to enhance student behavior and citizenship.
Chambers, Shamica	Reading Coach	Ms. Chambers serves on the leadership team and has the primary responsibility for overseeing the successful implementation of the reading and writing curriculum. Her main duties include facilitating professional learning to assist teachers with effective instructional practices based on student progress monitoring data, as well as facilitating weekly common planning sessions with grade level teams. She regularly analyzes common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact student achievement. She also provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on assessments in reading and supports teachers with data collection and analysis as a member of the MTSS team.
Thrift, Michelle	Math Coach	Ms. Thrift serves on the leadership team and has the primary responsibility for overseeing the successful implementation of the math and science curriculum. Her main duties include facilitating ongoing, job-embedded professional development and utilizing the coaching cycle to build teacher capacity. She provides guidance to teachers on lesson planning and regularly analyzes common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact student achievement. As an integral part of Tier II support, she provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on math and science assessments. Ms. Thrift sponsors the STEM club, serves on the Literacy Leadership Team to promote literacy schoolwide, and is

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		responsible for assisting with the coordination of math and science tests and district competitions.
Williams, Ronald	Dean	Mr. Williams is responsible for the school-wide implementation of CHAMPS/ Positive Behavior Intervention Services (PBIS) to enhance student behavior and citizenship. He works closely with the administrative team to monitor behavior interventions, provide teachers with professional learning in managing behaviors, and facilitate mentoring programs. He regularly reviews behavior data and makes recommendations for adjustments to the school-wide behavior framework and incentive plans based on this data. He supports teachers with data collection and analysis as a member of the MTSS team.
Ludwig, Janet	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Ludwig is responsible for the data collection and documentation for students who are being considered for eligibility for exceptional student education services. She assists in the development and renewal of all IEPs and monitors to ensure that students receive the appropriate supports based on their accommodations. Her duties also extend to identifying, assessing, evaluating, and monitoring the progress of ESOL students and former ESOL students on a 2 year monitoring plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 3/26/2021, Melanie Simmons

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Total number of students enrolled at the school

274

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems**2021-22****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	46	54	44	51	57	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	299
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	11	12	11	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	0	8	9	9	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	12	11	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	11	12	11	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/15/2021

2020-21 - 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	14	37	45	56	59	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	12	19	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	17	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

2020-21 - 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	14	37	45	56	59	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	12	19	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	17	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				29%	57%	57%	22%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	58%	58%	27%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	52%	53%	21%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				49%	63%	63%	29%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				75%	61%	62%	32%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72%	48%	51%	25%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				32%	56%	53%	29%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	25%	55%	-30%	58%	-33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	57%	-20%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2021					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	56%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	63%	-21%	64%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	54%	-22%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool used for data collection for Grades 1 and 2 was i-Ready EOY data, and for Grades 3-5 FSA data was used.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	5
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	5
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	21
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	14
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	14
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	5
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	33
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	37
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	0	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD				8							
BLK	23	55		32	41		25				
FRL	22	55		35	45		25				
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	14			29							
ELL	46	60		62	90						
BLK	29	54	59	48	76	74	32				
FRL	28	51	59	50	73	67	31				
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		7	8	7	29						
BLK	22	26	18	29	31	23	27				
FRL	23	29	21	32	35	28	31				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	176
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	4
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends that emerged include severe reading deficiencies in grades 3-5 as evidenced by 22% of the students demonstrating on-grade level proficiency in English Language Arts. This represents a drop of 7 percentage points from the 2018-2019 state assessments. Further disaggregation shows 14% of our fourth grade students were proficient in comparison to 21% of our third grade students and 33% of our fifth grade students. Math deficiencies were also evidenced by 31% of students demonstrating on-grade level math proficiency. This represents a drop of 4 percentage points from the 2018-2019 state assessments. Further disaggregation shows 28% of our fourth grade students were proficient in comparison to 35% of our third grade students and 37% of our fifth grade students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement was English Language Arts with 22% of the students in grades 3-5 showing on-grade level proficiency. 4th grade had the greatest need with 14% proficiency followed by 3rd grade with 21% proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors include teacher's lack of experience in effectively utilizing the virtual learning platforms to deliver purposeful intensive instruction in English Language Arts as the majority of our students were learning from home. The reading intervention plan was not implemented with fidelity as it was difficult to deliver small group and targeted instruction virtually. New actions taken to address this need for improvement include developing targeted lessons to meet the students learning needs during reading intervention in small group, extra hour of reading, and FBS. The reading Instructional Coach will meet with teachers during common planning to review and model expectations for implementing the curriculum materials to be used to support students and monitor their progress. Teachers will continue to deliver standards-based instruction aligned to the depth and rigor of the standards in English Language Arts. The Administrative team will monitor by conducting regular classroom walkthroughs, providing feedback to teachers, monitoring student progress and making adjustments to the groups as needed. Teachers have additional support this year with the use of interventionists who will be pulling small groups in reading and math and providing more targeted support.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

No improvement was shown.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

No improvement was shown.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

New actions to facilitate school-wide improvement in student achievement in English Language Arts and Math included tiering our teachers in grades 3-5 and providing extensive coaching support to all tier III teachers. This will build capacity in teachers and improve pedagogical practices in all content areas resulting in highly effective instruction. The reading plan will be implemented with fidelity and instruction adjusted in accordance with student data.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers include implementation of reading intervention programs like SIPPS, LLI, Heggerty, and Phonics for Reading. This will ensure that the programs are taught with fidelity. Content area professional development is also provided in writing, math, science, and reading to increase teachers' knowledge base and build capacity to deliver standards-based cognitively engaging instruction.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Steps that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement include teachers utilizing instruction, tasks, and assessments that are aligned to the rigor and depth of the benchmarks as evidenced by classroom walkthrough observations and student achievement data. Teachers providing rigorous core instruction as measured by coaching logs, lesson plans, classroom walkthrough documentation, and bi-weekly assessment data. Teachers using data-driven small group differentiated instruction as measured by classroom walkthrough documentation, and bi-weekly assessment data. Teachers implement a SEL curriculum to support our students with self-management and responsible decision-making skills as measured by behavior documentation, student engagement, and bi-weekly assessment data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers will focus on the effective implementation of differentiated instruction. Teachers will effectively use Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) framework to identify students with specific needs that affect their learning and give appropriate interventions to support their learning. This was identified as a critical need because 22% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA during the 2020-2021 school year.

Measurable Outcome: Students in grades 3-5 reading proficiency will increase from 22% to 36% on the English Language Arts Assessment. ELA learning gains will increase from 55% to 86%, and ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 44% to 86%.

Monitoring: The administrative team will work closely to implement and monitor the reading intervention plan in tier II and tier III interventions through daily classroom walkthroughs with immediate feedback. Bi-weekly data meetings will be held to track student progress and make adjustments to instruction as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melanie Simmons (melanie.simmons2@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional development on the MTSS Framework, data collection and tracking, and progress monitoring student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reading proficiency will improve when the MTSS framework is implemented with fidelity, used to identify students with specific needs, and provide appropriate reading interventions to support their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Action steps to implement the MTSS framework includes providing professional development on the MTSS process, conduct bi-weekly data meetings to assess student progress and adjust instruction as needed. Implement the reading intervention plan and conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to monitor the reading program.

Person Responsible Melanie Simmons (melanie.simmons2@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers will focus on delivering standards based instruction in ELA, math and science using small groups that focus on targeted deficiencies in order to provide scaffolded, guided practice to deepen knowledge. It was identified as a critical need as 22% of our students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA, 31% were proficient in math, and 24% were proficient in science in the 2020-2021 school year.

Measurable Outcome: Students in grades 3-5 reading proficiency will increase from 22% to 36% on the English Language Arts Assessment. Math proficiency will increase from 31% to 41% on the Math Assessment, and science proficiency will increase from 24% to 36% on the Science Assessment. ELA learning gains will increase from 55% to 86%, and math learning gains will increase from 41% to 86%. ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 44% to 86%, and math learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 22% to 86%.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored by weekly common planning notes, common assessment data, and bi-weekly progress monitoring data. Coaching support will be provided to teachers in need and the administration team will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs with immediate feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melanie Simmons (melanie.simmons2@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Weekly professional learning communities (PLCs) will focus on deconstructing the standards to align instructional practices, as well as analyze common assessment data to identify gaps in the teaching and learning process and support students needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected as 22% of our students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA, 31% were proficient in math, and 24% were proficient in science in the 2020-2021 school year. This was a result of teachers not understanding the depth and rigor of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Action steps to implement are weekly common planning to deepen understanding of the standards and share best practice strategies, provide coaching support to build teacher capacity in the use of higher order thinking questions, as well as monitoring and cognitive student engagement strategies as well as daily instructional walks.

Person Responsible Melanie Simmons (melanie.simmons2@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will improve the school culture, climate and student discipline by implementing a social and emotional school-wide initiative to establish and maintain positive interactions with all students and make connections academically and socially. This was identified as a critical need based on the ESSA subgroup data for 2018-2019 showing students with disabilities scoring below 32% for the past 2 consecutive years. These proficiency rates are below the federal index and will improve when students and staff effectively utilize social emotional learning strategies to build a more motivated and positive school culture.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities ESSA subgroup will meet the federal index target of 41%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through PLC logs, professional development logs, classroom walkthroughs to determine the effective implementation of the CHAMPS Behavior Management System, SEL curriculum, ESE facilitation support logs and data documentation, along with student progress monitoring data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie Simmons (melanie.simmons2@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The ESE support facilitation teacher will create lessons according to the students IEP goals and adhere to the ESE support facilitation schedule with fidelity. Teachers will review the student CUM folders and support students as per their IEP. Teachers will implement the CHAMPS Behavior Management System and SEL curriculum to support classroom behaviors and improve student cognitive engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The ESE support facilitation schedule is designed to ensure that students with disabilities are receiving instruction as per their IEPs. Teachers review the student's CUM folders to become familiar with the required supports needed for student success. The CHAMPS Behavior Management System and SEL curriculum is designed to support classroom behaviors and improve student cognitive engagement as teachers practice routines and procedures, embed collaborative structures in the classroom with roles for students to promote student self-awareness, self-control, responsible decision making, and relationship building skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Action steps that will be taken include creating the ESE facilitation support schedule with the ESE teacher as per students IEPs, providing school-wide professional development in the implementation of CHAMPS and SEL along with promoting character education. This will be monitored by the dean, guidance counselor and administrative team.

Person Responsible Melanie Simmons (melanie.simmons2@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on the Florida School Safety County Dashboard for Orange County, discipline data at Rock Lake Elementary is below the county average of 3 incidents per 100 for elementary schools. Areas of concern for Rock Lake Elementary is primarily minor misconduct level 1 offenses which will be addressed with the implementation of the CHAMPS and SEL curriculum. The school culture and environment will be monitored by analyzing bi-weekly discipline data. The dean has full responsibility for implementing the school-wide CHAMPS behavior plan which focuses on establishing routines and procedures resulting in a positive and structured learning environment. The guidance counselor along with classroom teachers will utilize SEL strategies in the classroom to promote goal setting, student self-awareness, self-control, responsible decision making, and relationship building skills resulting in increased cognitive engagement, improved student scores, and positive interactions between teachers and students.

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.

Families are given many opportunities to meet the classroom teacher and receive information regarding the expectations of their student's classroom. On the first day of school, all parents are welcome to visit their children's teachers when they drop their students off on campus. Teachers communicate regularly with parents using Classroom DoJo, emails, and phone calls. When parents and the school have open lines of communication, students are better adjusted to school and have higher levels of academic achievement. Parental involvement resources provide families with activities that build a stronger home-school connection and assist parents with strategies to support their child's development. The Parent Engagement Liaison assists with the planning and facilitation of these events. Rock Lake Elementary, with support from the Partners in Education supports the neediest families by providing them with access to a variety of wrap-around services. A Love Pantry and a uniform closet are stocked and available here on campus to address basic needs that impact the social emotional well being of students. The PEL, the guidance counselor, and the social worker reach out to students and families as needed to help connect services that address social emotional needs. The guidance counselor provides group counseling sessions, one on one counseling sessions and classroom guidance lessons. Families are also connected to outside counseling through Sednet Services. The guidance counselor coordinates a school mentoring program. Students are identified by staff and assigned an adult mentor to meet with them on a monthly basis. Mentors are recruited from teachers and staff. An important school initiative is the implementation of a Social Emotional Learning (SEL)

curriculum where teachers embed SEL strategies in lessons to promote relationship building, responsible decision making, self-awareness and self-control.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Rock Lake staff, teachers, and students are active stakeholders responsible for promoting a positive culture and environment. Staff members greet students on arrival as they enter the cafeteria to enjoy a healthy breakfast, staff is also on hand to welcome and address parent concerns in the front office. Teachers stand at their classroom door and greet students on entry. During instruction, teachers incorporate collaborative structures in their daily lessons as part of SEL to ensure that students are practicing self-awareness, self-control, and responsible decision-making skills as they work and learn together. Data chats with students include goal setting and goal attainment promoting a growth mindset. The guidance counselor implements character education and weekly celebrations are centered around students who exemplify the relevant character traits.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		239-Other	0641 - Rock Lake Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Incentives for staff and students</i>			
Total:						\$0.00