Rochelle School Of The Arts

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

Demographics

Principal: Carol Griffin

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	92%
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 (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ward, Julie	Principal	Lead all effort and work of the staff, school, and students.
Brackman, Lee	Assistant Principal	Support all work of the school
Bryant, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	Support all work of the school
Mayes, Kim	Reading Coach	Lead and support ELA work with instructional staff
Ross, Ariel	Math Coach	Lead and support all math work of the staff
Whiteside, Heather	Other	Lead all school, district, and state assessment processes

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/23/2015, Carol Griffin

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

800

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

4

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

6

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/23/2021

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	13	18	18	17	15	0	0	0	0	89

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	13	18	18	17	15	0	0	0	0	89

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				63%	61%	61%	54%	54%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	58%	59%	47%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	49%	54%	48%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				59%	61%	62%	56%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains				50%	56%	59%	54%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	52%	48%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				44%	52%	56%	47%	48%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	79%	78%	97%	85%	77%

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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	48%	17%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	47%	13%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
06	2021					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	64%	48%	16%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
07	2021					
	2019	59%	42%	17%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
08	2021					
	2019	63%	48%	15%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019	48%	47%	1%	55%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
07	2021					
	2019	60%	39%	21%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2021					
	2019	38%	35%	3%	46%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	48%	41%	7%	48%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	81%	70%	11%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math progress monitoring is completed using STAR Early Literacy, Reading, and Math assessments in the Fall, Winter, and Spring. Civics & Science progress monitoring occurs with the district quarterly assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64	85	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	70	58
	Students With Disabilities	25	75	25
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75	74	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	65	54
	Students With Disabilities	50	25	25
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	87	88	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	84	88	77
	Students With Disabilities	100	100	60
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63	65	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	56	63
	Students With Disabilities	38	38	38
	English Language Learners	67		

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62	68	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	53	41
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	
	English Language Learners	67	67	67
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	74	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	56	39
	Students With Disabilities		25	13
	English Language Learners	67	67	67

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62	70	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	58	44
	Students With Disabilities	30	20	30
	English Language Learners	40	40	60
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57	59	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	53	31
	Students With Disabilities	10	20	20
	English Language Learners	60	60	60

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56	53	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	42	30
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	67	50	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	43	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	35	26
	Students With Disabilities			33
	English Language Learners	50	83	20
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	33	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	23	46
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	59	31	46

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	55	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	45	52
	Students With Disabilities		22	30
	English Language Learners	50	33	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	46	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	35	30
	Students With Disabilities	10		
	English Language Learners	25	25	25

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56	52	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	38	40
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	50	50	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	61	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	54	43
	Students With Disabilities	20	40	40
	English Language Learners	33	67	50
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	73	55	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	41	42
	Students With Disabilities	33		
	English Language Learners	72	54	62

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	57	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	43	46
	Students With Disabilities		17	20
	English Language Learners	100	100	100
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	73	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	68	65
	Students With Disabilities	33	67	50
	English Language Learners	100	100	100
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	58	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	39	35
	Students With Disabilities	17		
	English Language Learners	71	57	53

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	39	38	13	39	37					
ELL	35	38		35	50						
BLK	44	50	43	39	40	34	25	72	80		
HSP	57	57		54	57	57	45	82	85		
MUL	79	67		42	47						
WHT	71	64	46	72	61	61	49	90	87		
FRL	43	47	36	40	38	35	22	66	84		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	33	41	25	29	18					
ELL	53	64		42	27						
BLK	50	52	47	48	43	41	25	65	89		

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
HSP	66	59	53	61	55	57	44	85	67		
MUL	63	64		56	50						
WHT	81	64	54	75	57	48	68	97	92		
FRL	55	52	45	51	46	46	28	80	78		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	48	56	4	38	40					
ELL	28	44		39	44						
BLK	41	44	49	44	50	51	28	90	86		
HSP	56	54	60	55	46	28	56				
MUL	54	39		58	65		64				
WHT	72	50	36	74	62	48	76	100	72		
FRL	46	43	46	50	53	48	40	95	72		

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	47
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	62
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	67
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	46
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?

STAR ELA 20-21 assessments averaged a decline of 5.5% from the fall to the spring assessments, and STAR Math 20-21 assessments averaged a decline of 2.6% from the fall to the spring assessments. (Grades 3-8)

20-21 Spring quarterly assessments in Science (4, 5, 8) and Civics & US History indicate the school is performing above the district average in all tests, except for 5th grade Science.

Most proficiency levels for STAR and Quarterlies fall in the 43-77% range, with averages of 53%. Math proficiency is weaker than ELA proficiency for most grade levels, notably 5th grade.

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

Math continues to be a weak area, especially for students not participating in advanced or accelerated math courses. The students receiving AL 1, 2, and 3 need scaffolded supports, stronger fact fluency, and stronger skills in reading and writing to more confidently approach the rigorous math instruction.

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

Possible contributing factors to the decline over the course of the year include:
3rd-5th grade teachers were departmentalized prior to 20-21. Due to COVID protocols, classes were self-contained, and some teachers lacked skills and knowledge to provide rigorous instruction in the subjects they had not previously taught.

Students continued to transition to Campus learning from eLearning as the year progressed. There is a lack of confidence in the validity of the fall progress monitoring scores, as 52% of students were in an eLearning environment. Additionally, the eLearners lacked the same level of interactive learning and feedback that Campus learners received, and often the adult supports in the household did not provide the supports needed.

A strong schoolwide focus on fact fluency at each grade level at the beginning of the year and continuing as appropriate throughout the year will support this weak area for students.

3rd-5th grade classes will return to departmentalization in 21-22, allowing teachers to focus more specifically on a narrow area of content area instruction.

Transitioning to the BEST standards will also be an important part of the 21-22 year (K-2 fully, 3-8 transitionally).

Having all students return to Campus learning, with hopefully reduced times of quarantine and no hybrid learning, is anticipated to positively impact student learning.

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

2019 FSA ELA data improved from 2018 and was above district and state averages for all tested grade levels (3-8).

Grades 3-8 showed an average of 54% in the 2021 spring assessment for STAR of proficiency in Reading, which is a decline from the 63% schoolwide average on the 2019 FSA ELA. All grades (K-8) had an average of 85.6% on all AR tests in 2021, indicating a strong level of comprehension.

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

Readers Workshop was fully implemented as a supplemental approach to reading instruction in 2018-19 and continued through the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school years. Middle school classes incorporated high-interest novel studies which were often differentiated by ability and/or interest. We have continued with a focus on standards-based instruction.

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

Readers Workshop and Accelerated Reader support students in elementary grades increasing their reading levels individually as skills increase. Teachers monitor and reset goals and reading levels with students quarterly.

Math fact fluency challenges for elementary students were incorporated with 3rd graders in 2020-21, resulting in many students mastering multiplication facts ahead of the instructional schedule.

Middle school students' schedules will be individually reviewed in consultation with test results and teacher input to place all students in accelerated math, science, social studies, and language arts classes who demonstrate aptitude in each area.

Elementary teachers will provide daily Tier 2 and weekly Tier 3 instruction for students in reading and math to address significant gaps in learning and achievement.

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.

A review of 2020-21 discipline data indicates a continued disproportionate number of males, black males, black females, and white males receiving office referrals compared to the total school population.

We will engage in a staff book study in 2020-21, "Poor Students, Rich Teaching" by Eric Jensen. The focus of this professional learning will be to impact all instruction in all classes for ALL students.

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

Stronger focus on PBIS, positive rewards/recognition, building relationships.

Comprehensive implementation of Project-Based Learning for students across all grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	State, District, and school initiatives have been implemented with goals of improving instructional practice, student engagement, and learning achievement. Our Leadership Team recognizes inconsistencies in knowledge and implementation practices by teachers which impacts lesson preparation, differentiation, student engagement, learning, class/ school climate, and ultimately student achievement. FSA data from 18-19 indicates significant gaps in achievement between the total population and some subgroups, notable African American students, Economically Disadvantages Students, and Students With Disabilities. Setting clear expectations for the teachers' consistent implementation and focus of evidence-based strategies and then monitoring the implementation will positively impact learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Formative: Monthly focus area in 1-2 categories aligned with state, district, and/or school initiatives related to school/classroom climate and/or instructional & engagement strategies. All teachers will receive feedback through the Journey observation system focused on monthly focus area's evidence of implementation during instruction. Measurable outcome of 85% or more of all K-8 and Arts teachers will implement monthly focus areas as expected by the end of the month. Summative: School Grade points of 536 (2018-19), 60% of available points, will increase to 563, 63% of available points in 2021-22.
Monitoring:	Administrators will monitor classroom observations with a school-based feedback tool for each focus area. Teachers Not Meeting or Partially Meeting will be revisited during the month to note progress toward Meeting the expectations of the focus area.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Receiving Feedback on learning and practices can result in an effect size of .74 (Hattie and Marzano). Monitoring of teacher implementation of identified focus areas through "Walk-Throughs and Feedback" - potential correlation with student academic achievement: Teacher-Student Relationship, Effective Questioning Techniques, and Student Engagement (.48-.54 effect size, Hattie & Marzano); Monitoring & Evaluating (.27), Focus (.24), School Culture (.25), Intellectual Stimulation with current theories and practices (.24) - Source: "School Leadership That Works" Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When presented with professional learning, teachers are often overwhelmed at the point of implementation and practice. By identifying focus areas in two key areas (climate and instructional strategies/practices) on a monthly basis for PD, support, monitoring, and feedback, improved clarify will be gained by the administration and teachers. This will build capacity, strength, assist in idetnifying support needs, and will also hold administrators and teachers accountable for identified initiatives and practices set forth as school expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

2. Organize leadership team support for formative feedback, collaborative planning sessions, and professional development appropriate to each grade, initiative, or subject, including teacher leaders to support other teachers. Utilize these "in-house experts" also when additional support is needed for individual teachers, including the use of "demonstration classrooms" for teachers who could benefit from targeted support.

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

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

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

4. K-2 teachers will receive professional development on the BEST standards and available instructional resources for the BEST standards. Instructional coaches will support teachers through collaborative planning. Teachers in grades 3-8 will receive professional development on the transition to the BEST standards while maintaining appropriate instruction for the 21-22 FSA expectations. Feedback on instructional implementation will be provided to ensure rigorous instructional expectations for all grade levels.

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

5. Exceptional Student Education teachers, in collaboration with classroom teachers, will support Students With Disabilities in Goal Setting, based on specific academic areas of need. Elementary students will primarily focus on oral reading fluency and math facts fluency, as these areas often interrupt students' comprehension and ability to access multi-step, more complex academic tasks. Middle School students will focus on progress toward grade level reading and math achievement. Students will be guided in data tracking (based on availability of unique data) with FSA achievement levels, STAR Reading and Math progress monitoring, oral reading fluency (wcpm), math fact fluency (# of facts, fact families), and other data as appropriate to students' needs. ESE teachers will utilize effective feedback strategies with students through the goal setting process. Quarterly reviews between ESE teachers and administrators will occur to provide feedback on the progress of strategies.

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the diverse population of our school, and a close examination of student performance across race, ethnicity, and other subgroups during the 2018-2019 school year, it is essential to develop culturally responsive educators who understand how social, economic, cultural, and systematic factors all influence the level of learning and types of access and opportunities these environments provide to our students. According to our 2018-2019 ESSA report, there were disparities with African-American and Economically Disadvantaged students, as well as Students With Disabilities. Therefore, teachers must be prepared with a thorough understanding of the various backgrounds and learning styles of the students they teach. In addition, it is necessary to strengthen our teachers' awareness of how these factors affect student learning behaviors and how that can change the dynamics in a classroom and student interactions. It is our goal to reduce existing opportunity gaps and build student agency.
Measurable Outcome:	Formative assessments and behavioral data will be analyzed and discussed during PBIS meetings, PLCs, and monthly MTSS meetings to lead teachers in making immediate decisions regarding differentiation and personalization; culturally responsive teaching strategies will be implemented and modeled by staff members, and monitored by administration and/or leadership team members using Walkthroughs, professional and reflective conversations, PBIS data, and discipline records. Summative: (2018-2019) School Grade points of 536 (60% of available points) will increase to 563 (63% of possible points) in 2020-2021.
Monitoring:	Monthly discipline data will be reviewed in PBIS meetings (held separately for elementary and middle school). Individual students or teachers in need of tiers of support will be assisted by the leadership team to gain skills for success.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using Eric Jensen's book, "Poor Students, Rich Teaching" as a staff book study, teachers will implement culturally responsive teaching strategies Increasing teachers' awareness of practices that enhance and practices that hinder student learning and growth is the first step in affecting change. This professional development will be strengthened throughout the year via variety of Arts instruction, project-based learning opportunities, Teacher and Student Agency practices, MTSS/differentiated instruction, collaboration meetings, Growth Mindset conversations, and through personalized learning opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Seeing the disparity among our student subgroups, it is imperative that we bridge the divide by equipping teachers with academic and behavioral strategies that will make our students thirsty for education. By building effective teacher-student relationships, and staff and students understanding their thinking and behavioral preferences common language will be developed and relationships between teachers and students will be strengthened. This will build trust with students giving students the opportunities to learn, grow, and achieve at their highest levels.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Parent events on campus will vary in time-frame to provide additional opportunities for families to engage with the school.

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

2. Create a positive classroom culture that fosters an achievement mindset. When students clearly understand expectations and have predictable settings, they are more likely to experience success within different environments.
* CHAMPS (Conversation level, Help, Activity, Movement, and Participation) procedures - 3 positives-1 corrective/student/day.
*PBIS - teach expectations, reinforce through school-developed protocols in elementary and middle school
* Refresher trainings will be provided for all staff and a more in-depth training for new staff for each area.

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

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

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

4. ESE teachers, classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, and the Interventionist will provide support for students (MTSS groups and SWD) in Math and ELA identified through data analysis and teacher identification. This will assist in closing achievement and opportunity gaps for these students, focusing on "acceleration" rather than remediation for students. Before and after-school tutoring (extended learning) will be provided as much as possible to support students.

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

5. The instructional staff will engage in a book study with "Poor Students, Rich Teaching" by Eric Jensen to deepen understanding and develop skills to reach and inspire a diverse student population. The book study will occur in vertical teams of teachers when possible, approximately 10-15 teachers per group or in grade level teams. Teachers will develop goals and strategies to improve classroom practice following the completion of reflection activities in the book. Throughout the study, emphasis will be placed on highlighting relational, climate, engagement, and achievement mindsets of teachers (and subsequently students) that will address the needs of all students, with specific focus on sub-populations (students with disabilities, black males) that demonstrate a significant discrepancy in academic and behavioral achievement compared to the total population.

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

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

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

7. Social Emotional Learning will be addressed uniquely in elementary as teachers implement Sanford Harmony daily to build a classroom climate of empathy, respect, tolerance, and compassion. Middle school social-emotional learning will be taught through the district-provided mental health lessons.

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

8. Exceptional Student Education teachers, in collaboration with classroom teachers, will support Students With Disabilities in Goal Setting, based on specific behavioral or work habit areas of need to maximize time focused on academic and learning opportunities. Support structures may include Check In/Check Out (Tier 2), class/homework completion tracking.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA Data for the 2020-21 school year reflected the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency (as evidenced by achievement level 3 or higher) as only 42% in grade 5. This falls below the 50% benchmark identified by the state per HB7011. This goal is developed in response to the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE).
Measurable Outcome:	All grade levels will maintain or improve the percentage of students at level 3 or higher, and all will have a minimum of 50% of the students achieve level 3 or higher on the 21-22 FSA ELA assessment.
Monitoring:	STAR Reading data will be used to progress monitor the projected percentages of students by grade level. District writing progress monitoring will be reviewed. Elementary grade levels administer running records at least once each 9 weeks. Weekly reading tests (Florida Wonders) bi-weekly tests results. Middle school grades at interims and report cards will be monitored for progress toward grade level expectations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Ward (julie.ward@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Timely interventions are utilized to intervene at the point of need for students with reading deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The sooner the interventions can occur unique to the identified problem, the greater the likelihood of reducing the deficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. 3rd-5th grade teachers have returned to a departmentalized structure in 21-22, with teachers specializing in ELA instruction for planning and instructional delivery. Detailed conversations during collaborative planning related to the grade level specific standards occur weekly.

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

2. FastBridge (provided by the district) will be used in middle school intensive reading classes to diagnose foundational reading needs of students. Interventions will be developed based on identified needs. The 5th grade students who scored AL1 are taking intensive reading this year as 6th graders. Most all 5th grade students who scored an AL 2 are also in intensive reading.

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

3. Professional Development provided with district specialist for K-5 teachers on MTSS and timely, appropriate interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3.

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

4. Goal setting will be incorporated with elementary students for Accelerated Reading, targeting percent accuracy and monitoring reading levels for grade level proficiency during independent reading.

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

5. Intervention strategies for Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading support in elementary has been aligned to provide greater consistency and progress monitoring.

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

After school tutoring for reading provided for elementary and middle school students identified for reading support.

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

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.

The Safe Schools for Alex website for 2019-20 data indicated a report of 1.5 incidents per 100 students, placing Rochelle in the "High" category for school incidents. 2020-21 data was not available on this website as of July 22, 2021.
A review of school data from Focus indicated a total of 301 incidents in 2020-21, representing 106 students or 739 total population. The highest number of average incidents was 3.77 for black males, accounting for 39% of all office discipline referrals, and 30% of all students receiving referrals. The next highest was 2.35 incidents for white males, accounting for 31% of all office discipline referrals, and 13% of all students receiving referrals. The third highest average number of incidents was 2.43 for black females, accounting for 24% of all office discipline referrals, and 28% of all students receiving referrals.
Monthly PBIS meetings (held separately for elementary and middle school) will include a review of the year-to-date discipline data and time will be dedicated to problem-solving and discussion of appropriate tiered interventions for students and/or staff.

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.

Rochelle's school culture starts with our core values/expectations of Respect, Safety, Active Learning, Unity and Creativity. Respect is taught to our students so they have regard for the feelings, wishes, rights, and

traditions of others. Safety is discussed daily and practiced throughout the year through safe classroom and campus practices, many safety drills, as well as the regular washing of hands and the use of hand sanitizer. Active Learning is shown through student engagement in the lesson and student agency. A strong majority of the instructional staff has been trained with Emergenetics which supports teaching to all thinking and behavioral preferences. Rochelle is a K-8 school so Unity is taught as a sense of pride in our school, the campus and supporting and encouraging each other. As a school of the arts, the students are encouraged to show their Creativity through different art mediums and in thinking strategies in multiple content areas.

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

Our school hosts Data Nights, where parents and students have the opportunity to meet with teachers regarding student performance, and how to enrich and engage student learning for all students. We utilize a school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support model of support for our students, designed to increase communication on school expectations to our students and parents regarding student trends in behavior..

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

All stakeholders (students, staff, parents, and community) are constantly made aware and reminded of our core values in meetings, assemblies, concerts, presentations of learning, exhibitions, and publications. Our school provides many opportunities for stakeholders to take part in building the positive culture. Student performers also recognize their roles as ambassadors of the school when opportunities occur beyond the school campus.

Our school utilizes a School Advisory Counsel, comprised of parents, community partners, and teachers, to assist in decisions for the school based on our mission. Regular meetings are held to update stakeholders on current and upcoming events, as well as take part in discussions regarding the direction of the school pertaining to the school vision and mission. Our PTA also contributes to the school climate with recognition programs for students, purchasing items to support a positive school environment, building opportunities for families to engage in learning experiences, and supporting teachers through grants.

A team of student ambassadors from middle school homeroom classes meets to bring ideas and suggestions to administration to assist with creating a school culture where students and teachers come together to create positive environments

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback				$76,792.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	100-Salaries	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		$76,792.00
			Notes: Reading Instructional Coach salary total			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				$5,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

	6150	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		$3,500.00
		Notes: Student Agendas and supplies				
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		$1,900.00
		Notes: Reading & Math Instructional Supplies				
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$2,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	0261 - Rochelle School Of The Arts	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
		Notes: Salaries for after school tutoring				
					Total:	**$84,192.00**