Marion County Public Schools

Romeo Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 16

Positive Culture & Environment 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Houle

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 16

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Houle, Jennifer	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. She also tracks district and school data. 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.
Fennewald, Kimberly	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 data. She also assist teachers in understanding how to use data from summative and formative assessments to plan 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 to support students.
Crowder, Stacie	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Crowder is the math and science coach or content area specialist (CAS). She models standards-based math and science lessons for teachers and assists teachers in the implementation of standards based lessons. The Math/Science CAS also assists in progress monitoring both instruction and student progress in the areas of math and science 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/science 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/science CAS also works alongside district science program specialists to assist teachers in planning and implementing hands-on science lessons.
Williams, Susan	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Williams is the literacy coach or content area specialist (CAS) for reading. 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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burns-Wein, Rebecca	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.
Deneau, Ashley	School Counselor	The school counselor develops a cohesive guidance plan to support school initiatives while safeguarding the social, emotional, and mental health of students. She provides support to small groups as well as individuals and works in partnership with Romeo families to address the needs of the whole child. The school counselor tracks student data to ensure adequate progress is made with students. She also partners with local community organizations to provided needed goods and services to Romeo families.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Jennifer Houle

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	111	111	119	126	99	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	696
Attendance below 90 percent	72	50	59	66	50	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
One or more suspensions	2	8	15	12	9	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	15	7	31	26	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	13	3	28	15	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	54	28	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	44	12	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	23	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	18	8	40	29	13	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	47%	56%				49%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	61%				58%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	51%	52%				48%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	60%				55%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%	62%	64%				61%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	55%				61%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	42%	51%				49%	47%	53%

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**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	43%	44%	-1%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	49%	3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	45%	-1%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	46%	44%	2%	53%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	45	53	21	45	42	6				
ELL	32	52	47	57	64	67	21				
HSP	40	52	58	56	61	62	28				
MUL	28	38		56	57						
WHT	39	51	50	53	68	50	42				
FRL	36	49	51	53	62	54	31				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 from the FSA indicates that student overall performance in relation to performance in ELA is continuing to trend down. In the 2018-2019 school year, 49% of students were proficient in ELA. No state data was collected in the 2019-2020 school year. During the 2020-2021 school year 42% of students were proficient. In the 2021-2022 school year, ELA proficiency dropped again to 39%. While the proficiency level in 3rd through 5th grade is declining the percent of students making learning gains and learning gains in the bottom quartile is increasing. ELA learning gains in 2021-2022 went up to 50% from 43% in the previous year. The learning gains in the bottom quartile for ELA also increased to 51% from 42 percent the previous year.

Math data trends do not reflect the same significant percent difference. The math proficiency percent increased to 54% for the 2021-2022 school year from 52% the previous year. Prior to that, the math proficiency rate was 55%. The percentage of learning gains increased to 64% from 50% the previous year. The math learning gains in our bottom quartile dropped drastically and has been inconsistent over the past several years. Only 55% of students in the bottom quartile reported a learning gain in the 2021-2022 school year. This was down from 79% the previous year, and 61% in the 2018-2019 school year.

The science data has shown the least consistency with 36% proficient in 2021-2022 compared to 28% in 2020-2021 and 49% in 2018-2019.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The core subject areas of ELA and Science reflect the most drastic need for improvement with a consistent downward trend in reading proficiency.

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

Tier 1 instruction is not consistently aligned to the depth and breadth of the standards. Student assignments do not consistently align to the rigor of the standard. New actions to address this area needing improvement will include intentional, structured collaborative planning 2x per week for tier 1 instruction as well as planning for formative and summative assessments. Teachers will also participate in instructional rounds to view the implementation of standards aligned instruction to the new B.E.S.T. standards.

Students are not equipped with foundational skills in K-2 creating a skills gap, specifically in phonics. K-2 grades students will receive explicit phonics instruction through UFLI that will prepare our students to read and be proficient when entering the state tested grade levels of 3rd-5th.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Progress was made across multiple areas with the most progress being shown in the percentage of ELA learning gains in our bottom quartile. This area increased from 42% to 51%.

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

The leadership team targeted specific groups of students for weekly data monitoring. The students were also strategically place in their MTSS groups to phonics on their deficit area.
The leadership team will continue to target and monitor select groups of students and monitor data on a weekly basis. Conversations will be ongoing between the classroom teacher and the leadership team to ensure that we are make progress and make adjustments as needed.

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

Data will be used to plan for next steps for accelerating learning. During collaborative planning teachers will review previous formative assessment data in order to plan review lessons, reteach lessons, and extend the lesson. Student groups will be adjusted by 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.

Ongoing learning opportunities will take place with instructional coaches and district program specialists on using data to plan for instruction that is aligned to the depth of the standard. This will include strategies to meet the needs of all students on campus through the implementation of UDL. The staff will participate in a bookstudy-UDL Now and incorporate those principals into lessons during collaborative planning.

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 that are standards aligned, rigorous, and differentiated, with support from the leadership team. The leadership team will continue to share observation data from observations from informal walkthroughs with one another to devise teacher support. Best practices for ESE and ESOL students will be shared and highlighted. In addition UDL practices will be discusses

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Analysis of district and state assessment indicates a need to build lessons that are more closely aligned to the rigor of the B.E.S.T. standards in the core content areas of ELA and Math. Student performance data from 2019, 2021, and 2022 in inconsistent with data rising and falling from year to year. An adjustment of Tier 1 instruction to align consistently with the standards so students are prepared to demonstrate mastery.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	A focus on rigorous, aligned content that is differentiated will result in an overall proficiency increase of 3% in ELA and Math on the 2023 FAST statewide assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers will utilize well-planned lessons and execute instruction of rigorous standards based tasks allowing for differentiation of mastery with weekly checks for understanding and other formative assessment data to adjust instruction based on student need. The content area specialists will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and checks for understanding. Administrator walkthroughs and debriefs will also provide data to support implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will collaboratively plan using standards based resources to develop standard aligned tasks and formative assessments. Teachers will plan these lessons in collaborative planning twice per week with content area specialists and administration. This process will be regularly monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research indicates that both formative assessment and collaborative planning are high yield evidence based strategies. Teachers will utilize research based strategies from the the UDL-Now bookstudy to plan for standards based lessons that are differentiated and then create formative assessments to show mastery. Planned, explicit and rigorous tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development to assist them in the implementation of UDL strategies in their classroom. This resource will aid in the design of standards based instruction that is accessible to all students.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will plan standards-based lessons collaboratively during collaborative planning sessions. Data from district, state, and formative assessments will be used in planning for next steps, form student groups, and design remediation/enrichment opportunities.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on state achievement data in the area of Science, only 36% of tested students are proficient in Science. This is an increase form the previous years proficiency percent of 28% however, below the 49% and 53% proficiency averages that were achieved in the previous years.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	With explicit science instruction and vocabulary building, Science proficiency scores will increase by 10% as measured by the FCAT state assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	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 walkthroughs of science instruction, student engagement and vocabulary will be noted by administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	K-5 teachers will collaboratively plan standards based lessons that incorporate science vocabulary building opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Science standards are not all reciprocal creating gaps in a student's science knowledge and understanding from one grade level to the next. With an emphasis on science vocabulary building in all grades and access to hands on learning opportunities, students will have the background knowledge needed to prove proficiency on the 5th grade FCAT science assessment.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will plan standards based lessons with an emphasis on science vocabulary during collaborative planning with the support of the instructional coach.

Person Responsible Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students will have access to hands on science opportunities to reinforce vocabulary in a science lab environment.

Person Responsible Stacie Crowder (stacie.crowder@marion.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The area of focus for students in K-2nd grade is Phonics. With explicit and systemic phonics instruction students will have the foundational skills needed be meet proficiency when entering 3rd grade and beyond.
-Students that do not have mastery of phonics skills are not able to decode words and become fluent readers.
-26 students are currently under mandatory retention in 3rd grade with phonics being 1 or more grade levels below according to the iReady assessment.
In addition to explicit phonics instruction in K-2, implementation of standard aligned tasked in 2nd grade.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The area of focus for 3rd-5th grade is adjusting Tier 1 instruction to align consistently with the standard to the rigor of the standard. FSA data at the end of the 2021-2022 school year shows the following ELA proficiencies by grade level:
3rd grade proficiency-22%
5th grade proficiency-40%
Students in 3rd-5th grade will also be identified early on to provide interventions in foundational skills during MTSS instruction.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

With explicit explicit phonics instruction in foundation skills, the percentage of students exiting the grade level on or above grade level will increase by 5% based on the state STAR assessment.
2021-2022 iReady data (percentage of students on or above grade level AP3):
kinder-84%
1st-56%
2nd-52%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

With standards aligned Tier 1 instruction and Foundational Skills interventions, the percent of students in 3rd grade who will be proficient on the Fast will increase by 5%.

With standards aligned Tier 1 instruction, the percent of students in 5th grade who will be proficient on the FAST will increase by 7%

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitoring will occur through data meetings at collaborative planning sessions when school formative assessments, district assessments, and state assessment is reviewed. The information will be used to adjust the areas of need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Houle, Jennifer, jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teachers will collaboratively plan using standards based resources to develop standard aligned tasks and formative assessments. Teachers will plan these lessons in collaborative planning twice per week with content area specialists and administration. This process will be regularly monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Research indicates that both formative assessment and collaborative planning are high yield evidence based strategies. Teachers will utilize research based strategies from the the UDL-Now bookstudy to plan for standards based lessons that are differentiated and then create formative assessments to show mastery. Planned, explicit and rigorous tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership: 1.The leadership team will review data from district, state, and class assessments. Data from district, state, and formative assessments will be used in planning for next steps, form student groups, and design remediation/enrichment opportunities. 2.The leadership team will monitor standards-based lessons during collaborative planning sessions. Literacy Coaching: 1. The Reading CAS will help facilitate weekly collaboration meetings. 2. The Reading CAS will model lessons for teachers during collaborative planning and in the classroom. Assessment: 1. Create formative assessments that are aligned to the BEST standards. 2. Align local assessments to state assessments-depth of standard. Professional Learning 1.Teachers will be give PD on strategies to allow for engagement and understanding to reach the needs of all learners in the classrom. 2.Teachers will participate in school and district trainings for the implementation of the new BEST standards.	Houle, Jennifer, jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The faculty and staff at Romeo Elementary believes 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 are 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 a 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 school culture and environment.

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 thy 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 1 Parent Resource Center to support learning. Volunteers contribute by working directly with the 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 supplies, help for families in need, teacher appreciation events, and volunteering. The school business partner also visits the school monthly to participate in read alouds to all students. Stakeholders know our Pioneer Expectations to ensure all students have a successful learning environment.