Marion County Public Schools

Romeo Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Houle

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission at Romeo Elementary is to support the Marion County Public School system in developing successful citizens. Romeo Elementary will provide all students with the opportunity to achieve their personal best through building good character, learning to respect themselves and others, accepting responsibility for their actions, and developing a perpetual love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Parker, Suzette	Principal	The school principal serves as the instructional leader by providing professional learning opportunities for teachers aligned to standards-based instruction. The principal also facilitates the school's collaborative planning sessions and builds opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional rounds to foster professional growth and development. The principal provides feedback to teachers to improve standards-based instruction and tracks formative assessment data weekly. She also tracks data from district and iReady assessments and assists teachers in understanding how to use that data to plan instruction. The principal also oversees the leadership team and delegates tasks such as coaching, data collection, and specified collaborative planning processes, and other duties as assigned.
Williams, Susan	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal works with the leadership team to support teachers in both planning and implementing instruction aligned to the standards. The assistant principal also facilitates the school's collaborative planning sessions and supports opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional rounds to foster professional growth and development. The assistant principal provides feedback to teachers to improve standards-based instruction and disaggregates formative assessment data weekly. She also assists teachers in understanding how to use data from summative and formative assessments to plan instruction. The assistant principal oversees, ensures data is tracked, collected, and utilized for the next steps in instruction. She is the leader in managing instructional materials for teachers. The assistant principal supports our ESOL students by training and scheduling ESOL paraprofessionals effectively optimum support of students.
Crowder, Stacie	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Crowder is the math coach or content area specialist (CAS). She models standards-based math lessons for teachers and assists teachers in the implementation of standards-based lessons. The math CAS also progress monitors both instruction and student progress in the area of math while providing support in the implementation of professional development initiatives. In addition, she supports math interventions and assists in monitoring the fidelity of these interventions. The math CAS also designs and implements targeted professional development for teachers in the areas of math and science. She serves as a resource and point person for collaborative planning in both the areas of math and science. The math CAS works alongside district science program specialists to assist teachers in planning and implementing hands-on science lessons correlated to the nature of science.
Jeter, Loralee	Dean	The dean supports systems that facilitate a safe and orderly environment where all students can learn safely. She monitors discipline data, provides follow-up mentoring for students, leads our PBIS team, and ensures students feel safe. The dean provides behavior instruction and often models classroom management practices for teachers who need assistance in this area.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Henry, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Henry is the literacy coach or content area specialist (CAS). She models standards-based reading lessons for teachers and assists teachers in the implementation of standards-based lessons. The literacy CAS also progress monitors both instruction and student progress in the area of reading while providing support in the implementation of professional development initiatives. In addition, she supports reading interventions and assists in monitoring the fidelity of interventions. The literacy CAS also designs and implements targeted professional development for teachers in the area of reading. She serves as a resource and point person for collaborative planning in both the areas of ELA and social studies.
Fleming, Gemma	School Counselor	The guidance counselor develops a cohesive guidance plan to support school initiatives while safeguarding the social, emotional, and mental health of students. She provides to small groups as well as individuals and works in partnership with Romeo families to address the needs of the whole child. The guidance counselor tracks student data to ensure adequate progress is made with students. She also partners with local community organizations to provide needed goods and services to Romeo families.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Jennifer Houle

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

690

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

0

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

0

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	106	115	89	113	132	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	664
Attendance below 90 percent	40	46	37	38	51	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	1	6	4	6	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	12	14	23	16	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	9	9	21	4	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	10	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	11	14	20	17	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/9/2021

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	97	125	121	143	100	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	970	1695
Attendance below 90 percent	28	29	17	21	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	8	10	13	2	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	46	18	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	39	26	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	106	115	89	113	132	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	970	1634
Attendance below 90 percent	28	29	17	21	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	8	10	13	2	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	46	18	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	39	26	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	4	16	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				49%	47%	57%	45%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	56%	58%	47%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	52%	53%	37%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	51%	63%	50%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	58%	62%	41%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	49%	51%	36%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	47%	53%	53%	51%	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	43%	44%	-1%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	49%	3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	65%	54%	11%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	45%	-1%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	46%	44%	2%	53%	-7%
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 tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:
• English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
• Mathematics, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
• Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8 / 8%	19 / 17%	40 / 36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 6%	15 / 17%	31 / 35%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 5%	3 / 15%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4 / 4%	15 / 14%	38 / 34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 5%	10 / 11%	28 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 5%	4 / 20%
	English Language Learners	1 / 4%	1 / 4%	1 / 4%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16 / 19%	15 / 18%	25 / 28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 16%	12 / 17%	17 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 17%	1 / 14%
	English Language Learners	1 / 8%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8 / 10%	6 / 7%	28 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 6%	5 / 7%	22 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 8%	1 / 7%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29 / 28%	19 / 17%	30 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 24%	14 / 16%	22 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	0 / 0%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	1 / 5%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5 / 5%	10 / 9%	25 / 22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 3%	8 / 9%	19 / 21%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 5%	1 / 5%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33 / 29%	27 / 21%	30 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20 / 24%	14 / 15%	18 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13 / 11%	19 / 15%	33 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 9%	12 / 13%	17 / 18%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25 / 25%	12 / 11%	16 / 15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 15%	5 / 7%	7 / 9%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	0 / 0%	2 / 12%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17 / 17%	14 / 13%	24 / 22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 16%	9 / 13%	15 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	40 / 40%	25 / 25%	23 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23 / 34%	13 / 19%	12 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 19%	2 / 13%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	1 / 7%	0 / 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	18	40	36	32	38		7				
ELL	31	47		48	70		19				
BLK	54			38							
HSP	36	44	46	51	61	69	20				
MUL	68			50	40		70				
WHT	41	43	36	56	67		28				
FRL	36	39	40	51	65	76	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	16	61	61	29	74	72	16				
ELL	39	59	52	46	54	55	35				
BLK	57			69							
HSP	42	57	52	48	53	59	38				
MUL	68			83							
WHT	53	61	46	57	69	75	55				
FRL	45	57	46	50	59	63	41				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	30	35	15	43	44	27				
ELL	21	33	39	37	33	32	17				
BLK	33	40		25	20						
HSP	38	48	35	49	39	28	48				
MUL	63			56							
WHT	50	43	38	53	43	42	60				
FRL	41	45	36	47	39	33	48				

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	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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Data indicates an inconsistent student performance as reflected in ELA proficiency with a rise in scores from 2018-2019 from 44% to 48% of students deemed proficient to a drop to 42% of students proficient on FSA ELA in 2021. Learning gains for students in the bottom quartile followed a trend similar with an increase from 2018-2019 and a decrease from 2019-2021 from 48% of the bottom quartile making learning gains in 2019 to only 42% demonstrating learning gains in ELA in 2021.

Math data trends do not reflect the same significant percent difference in proficiency from 2018-2021, but the trend still reflects inconsistency. In 2018, 47% of students were proficient in math compared to 53% in 2019 and 52% in 2021. Math learning gains in the bottom quartile have followed a significant positive trend from 36% of students making learning gains in 2018 to 61% in 2019 and 79% in 2021.

The area of science has shown the least consistency in student performance with 53% of students proficient in 2018, 46% in 2019, and only 28% in 2021.

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

The core subject areas of ELA and science reflect the most drastic inconsistent student performance from 2018-2021. However, the rise and fall in student performance indicate that all 3 core subject areas need to remain areas of focus.

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

Tier 1 instruction is not consistently aligned to the depth and breadth of the standard. Student assignments do not consistently align to the rigor of the standard, and tracking systems for student understanding of the standard are not in place across all settings. New actions to address these areas needing improvement will include intentional, structured collaborative planning 2x/ week for Tier 1 instruction as well as planning for formative and summative assessments. Training for implementing research-based formative assessments as well as tracking student data will be offered to all teachers. Teachers will participate in instructional rounds to view the implementation of standards-aligned instruction and to glean best practices.

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

Progress was evident across all subgroups in math in 2019. Math proficiency was 53% and math learning gains in the bottom quartile rose from 36% to 61%.

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

In 2019, 4th-grade math teachers led an initiative to utilize the Engage New York curriculum and resources. This was inclusive of using formative assessment data to frame the next steps. Some other grade-level teachers jumped on board. When the new principal came on board, teachers surveyed attributed their success in math to both the Engage NY resources and formative assessment practices.

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

Data from formative assessment will be used to plan the next steps for accelerating the learning. Each collaborative planning session will begin with a review of the previous week's formative assessment data in order to plan review lessons, reteach lessons, and extensions of the lessons. Student groupings will be adjusted as indicated by classroom 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.

Training will be provided on research-based formative assessment strategies and tools will be provided for tracking and using this classroom data. Teachers will engage in a book study, "Check for Understanding," to support their learning. Higher-order questions will be planned collaboratively and paraprofessionals and ESE teachers will support small groups of students as indicated by the data,

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

Standards-based, aligned Tier 1 instruction will continue to be the focus of teacher professional development and collaboration alike. Collaborative planning will prepare teachers for classroom instruction through the design of highly effective lessons plans vetted for standards alignment by teachers with support from the administrative team, The administrative team will continue to share observations from informal walkthroughs with one another in order to devise a teacher support schedule for teachers by specific personnel based on the needs shared. Best practices for ESE and ESOL students will be shared and highlighted by coaches during instructional rounds. Targeted feedback will be provided to teachers regarding standards alignment and other best practices as outlined in the FEAPS.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of district assessment data (specifically Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessments and iReady data) and state assessment data indicates a need to build lessons that are more closely aligned to the rigor of the standards in the core content areas of math, and science. Student performance from 2018, 2019, and 2021 is inconsistent with data rising and falling from year to year. This points to a need to adjust Tier 1 instruction to align consistently with the standards, so students are better prepared to demonstrate proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	A focus on rigorous, aligned science instruction, alongside the same focus in ELA. will result in a 15% increase in science proficiency on the 2022 FCAT Science Assessment. Standards-aligned practices in math will also result in a score increase of 3% in proficiency on the 2022 Florida Statewide. Assessment.
Monitoring:	Teachers will utilize well-planned checks for understandings and other formative assessment data to provide targeted small group instruction with administration monitoring implementation weekly. The content area specialists will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and checking for understanding. Administrator walkthroughs and debriefs will also provide data to support implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will collaboratively plan using standard-based resources to develop standard-aligned formative assessments. Teachers will plan these formative assessments and task-aligned lessons in collaborative planning twice per week with content area specialists and administration. This process will be regularly monitored as teachers use checks for understanding and the resulting student data in math, and science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that both formative assessment and collaborative planning are high-impact processes that result in student learning. Teachers will utilize research-based strategies from the schoolwide book study to craft standards-aligned formative assessments. Additionally, teachers will use iReady math toolbox, Social Studies and Science Weekly, and Stemscopes. Differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve learning gains will also be utilized. In addition, research shows that planned, explicit, and rigorous tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development to assist them in the implementation of the formative assessment cycle in the classroom. They will participate in a formative assessment book study; the book is titled "Check for Understanding," and will use that resource to aid in the design of formative assessments aligned to the depth and breadth of the standard.

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

Teachers will plan standards-based lessons collaboratively during collaborative planning sessions bi-weekly, Formative assessments will be vetted in collaborative planning teams, and data from these assessments will be used to plan the next steps, form student groups, and design remediation/ enrichment opportunities.

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

Teachers will participate in instructional rounds to glean best practices from peers. Rounds will focus on the implementation of the formative assessment cycle. Teachers will be challenged to develop and implement a common formative assessment aligned to practices learned in the book study, "Check for Understanding." Instructional rounds will include feedback related to this task.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2021 ELA progress monitoring data show the following percent of grades K-2 students not on track to secure a level 3 are: K=51%; 1st grade= 65%; and 2nd grade= 72%. 2021 ELA FSA data show the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 61% of 3rd grade, 55% of 4th grade, 61% of 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2021 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 49% of kindergarten students were proficient, 35% of 1st grade students were proficient, and 28% of 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement 52% of kindergarten, 38% of 1st grade, and 31% of 2nd grade students will be proficient. On the 2021 ELA FSA, 39% of 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 45% of 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 39% of 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA , 42% of 3rd grade, 48% of 4th grade, and 42% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.
Monitoring:	In addition to formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress: K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022 K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022 3-5: District QSMAs Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022 Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.During classroom walk throughs levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provide to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	K-5 teachers will collaboratively plan using standard-based resources to develop standard-aligned formative assessments. Teachers will plan these formative assessments and task-aligned lessons in collaborative planning twice per week with content area specialists and administration. This process will be regularly monitored as teachers use checks for understanding and the resulting student data in math, and science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that both formative assessment and collaborative planning are high-impact processes that result in student learning. Teachers will utilize research-based strategies from the schoolwide book study to craft standards-aligned formative assessments. In addition, research shows that planned, explicit, and rigorous tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan standards-based lessons collaboratively during collaborative planning sessions bi-weekly, Formative assessments will be vetted in collaborative planning teams, and data from these assessments will be used to plan the next steps, form student groups, and design remediation/ enrichment opportunities.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

N/A

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.

The faculty and staff of Romeo Elementary believe all students can behave appropriately especially when provided the best curriculum and environment necessary for optimum educational growth. In order to guarantee all students in the classroom an excellent learning climate, certain expectations and consequences have been developed. Through home and school working together, we can aid students in making appropriate decisions governing their behavior.

School-Wide Expectations
1. Be Responsible.
2. Be Respectful
3. Be Safe.
4. Be a Leader

These expectations are school-wide and will be visible to all students, parents, visitors, and volunteers. These expectations are the essential components students are taught to be successful. Students are continually exposed to the expectations and the rules through daily instruction.

The school creates a safe environment by modeling and providing a curriculum that focuses on creating a positive environment where students feel safe. The school uses a Positive Behavior Support program to help reinforce good choices and therefore creating knowledge and habits that students will need to be successful. Students are taught life lessons through a curriculum called the Caring School Community which helps them make better choices not only in school but also in their daily lives. These character lessons help teach students mutual respect and foster a positive learning environment within our school. The school goal is to provide students with the background knowledge to help them be successful as future productive citizens.

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

Teachers provide a positive learning environment where students feel safe to learn the standards while they teach students how to work socially with one another. Students can build positive life skills as they learn to work well with others and learn skills for their future. Families provide children with the tools necessary for optimal learning, such as positive partnerships with the teacher and administrators. Parents partner in learning by attending
school-parent trainings and conferences, utilizing district resources like Skyward Family Access and the District Title I Parent Resource Center to support learning. Volunteers contribute by working directly with students and teachers supporting learning by helping in the classrooms. SAC members support the school goals by providing feedback and support to the school leadership team. Romeo Elementary School's business partner plays a key role in building positive school culture and environment by providing resources such as school supplies, help for families in need, and volunteering at Career Day events and Teacher Appreciation events. The school business partner also visits the school monthly to participate in read alouds to all students. Stakeholders know, understand, and follow the Pioneer Expectations to ensure all students have a successful learning environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**