

Orange County Public Schools

Rosemont Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rosemont Elementary

4650 POINT LOOK OUT RD, Orlando, FL 32808

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

Demographics

Principal: Cruz Diaz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: D (33%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rosemont Elementary

4650 POINT LOOK OUT RD, Orlando, FL 32808

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

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 PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Ellis, Amanda	Principal	Dr. Ellis, principal of Rosemont Elementary is responsible for the overall functioning of the school and data for all grade levels. Dr. Ellis attends and facilitates Data/Multi-Tier Support Systems and Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings. Dr. Ellis monitors both lesson plans and classroom instruction through observations to ensure standards-based instruction and tasks are aligned to the standards. She provides actionable feedback to increase both teacher and student growth. Dr. Ellis communicates on a consistent manner with the stakeholders of the school be it parents, community members, business partners or district level staff.
Diaz, Cruz	Assistant Principal	In the role of Assistant Principal, Cruz Diaz participates in the ongoing process of progress monitoring of student achievement data. He is part of the Multi-Tier Support System team working with teachers to identify strategies both academic and behavioral to meet student needs. Mr. Diaz monitors the effectiveness of classroom instruction and provides actionable feedback to teachers which includes observing, coaching, and evaluating. Mr. Diaz attends ELA PLC meetings and supports the instructional coach and resource staff.
Young, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	In the role of Assistant Principal, Rebecca Young participates in the ongoing process of progress monitoring of student achievement data. She is part of Multi-Tier Support System team working with teachers to identify strategies both academic and behavioral to meet student needs. Mrs. Young monitors the effectiveness of classroom instruction and provides actionable feedback to teachers which includes observing, coaching, and evaluating. Mrs. Young attends Math PLC meetings and supports the instructional coach and resource staff.
Syphax, Zaneta	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Syphax is the Staffing Specialist at Rosemont Elementary. She is responsible for maintaining accurate reporting and compliance of our Students with Disabilities. She is the liaison with our parents seeking support for students in our ESE programs. She facilitates meeting with parents and district staff as well as works with teachers to provide best practices and instructional strategies to meet our ESE students' needs. She is a member of the Multi-Tier Systems of Support.
Talpade, Sandra	School Counselor	Ms. Talpade is the counselor at Rosemont Elementary. She provides personal and social growth counseling which includes individual and group counseling relating to academic success, understanding of self and others, communication skills, decision making, relationship skills, conflict resolution, and goal setting. Ms. Talpade provides crisis intervention services and follow-up services as appropriate.
Perno, Britany	Curriculum Resource Teacher	In her role as CRT and Instructional Coach, Ms. Perno utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in best practices for delivering standards-based

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instruction. She participates in grade level professional learning communities and provides mentoring and professional development to build teacher capacity.
Thomas, Carolyn	Dean	In her role as dean and behavioral MTTTS support, Ms. Thomas will ensure that teachers, staff members, and students are following our school-wide behavioral plan that includes CHAMPS and Caring School Communities. This will ensure that we support a culture of engagement, responsibility, and safety. Additionally, Ms. Thomas will support in the creation of systems that will contribute to our school-wide social emotional learning goals.
Norman, Deborah	Teacher, ESE	In her role as SLD teacher at Rosemont Elementary School, Mrs. Norman is responsible for working with our ESE students to meet their IEP goals. Mrs. Norman also works closely with the resource teacher that oversees the multi-tiered system of support. Mrs. Norman progress monitors our students with IEPs, ensuring the proper systems are in place to support these students, many of which are part of the lowest 25%.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Cruz Diaz

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.*

0

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

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

7

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

2

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	31	85	98	96	62	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	14	24	25	33	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	22	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	

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	0	1	0	6	17	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 8/17/2022

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	21	101	84	82	104	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	6	47	41	36	41	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	7	6	4	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	5	5	2	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	21	101	84	82	104	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	6	47	41	36	41	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	7	6	4	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	5	5	2	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	31%	56%	56%				38%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						57%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						61%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	46%	46%	50%				57%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						66%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						59%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	61%	59%				45%	56%	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	35%	55%	-20%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	63%	-9%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	57%	-16%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
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	13	40		35	60		18				
ELL	22	55		37	76		21				
BLK	26	53	47	41	68	65	32				
HSP	48	72		59	100		20				
WHT	60			90							
FRL	28	57	44	42	70	66	32				

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	4	8		15	18						
ELL	24			35							
BLK	23	36	56	30	25	29	24				
HSP	19			22							
FRL	24	36	56	29	25	18	24				
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	19	65	60	35	62	69	27				
ELL	35	53		45	72						
BLK	36	54	53	56	66	54	44				
HSP	41	67		66	81						
MUL	46			62							
FRL	36	56	61	57	63	47	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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	75
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	52
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?

As it relates to trends across grade levels, school-wide data indicates an improvement in proficiency in both reading and math across all three grade levels. Additionally, the learning gains in both reading and math improved across all three grade levels. However, the learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA saw a small decrease compared to the year before.

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

According to 2021-2022 FSA data, the data component that needs the greatest improvement is the learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA. The school decreased a total of 13 points in this component compared to the school year before.

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

Rosemont's school-wide 21-22 data indicates a 6 point improvement in proficiency in Reading and a 19 point improvement in learning gains for reading. However, learning gains of the lowest 25% in reading decreased by 13 points. This decrease in learning gains of the lowest quartile can be attributed to instability in ESE staff. In order to be in compliance for student IEPs, other staff members with ESE certification had to complete IEP minutes. This shifting of human resources created additional fidelity gaps with our MTSS process, specifically to those Tier 3 students. To address the improvement we will need to devise a more sustainable plan for IEP compliance. Additionally, reexamining the programs we use with our lowest quartile students during extra hour could assist at better meeting their needs. Finally, making adjustments to the core curriculum materials and the addition of close reading will provide the support needed for students to deepen their understanding.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is the learning gains of 4th and 5th graders in math. This component saw an improvement of 45 points compared to the 20-21 school year.

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

The contributing factors that led to the great improvement we saw in the learning gains across all grade levels in math is the additional Tier I interventionist positions as well as strategic grouping of students for math small group instruction. With the additional interventionist at each grade level, we were able to

provide the smallest group setting to our students and homogeneously group with learning gains in mind. Finally, groups were also put together with a priority on fostering positive relationships between students and teachers. We understand the impact that a strong relationship between a student and educator has on a child's educational outcomes.

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

To accelerate learning in both Math and ELA, there will be a continued focus on the use of Tier I interventionists and additional support staff. Teachers will be expected to learn and execute Rosemont's school-wide MTSS plan to ensure all students receive appropriate supports and interventions in deficient areas. Finally, we will continue our intense focus on the implementation and monitoring of a school-wide social emotional learning plan designed to help teachers and students grow in the areas of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making.

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.

To support teachers and school leaders the following professional learning opportunities will be provided.

- Weekly common planning in the areas of ELA/Math/Science/MTSS
- Data analysis in all content areas
- SEL

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

To ensure continued sustainability of improvement for the next school year and beyond, administration and members of the Rosemont leadership team will work collaboratively to strengthen school-wide systems in the areas of data analysis, grade-level collaboration, assessment and measurement, and reading/math interventions.

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 Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Rosemont increased in both reading and math proficiency during the 2021-2022 school year, however, the school was still below 2018-2019 proficiency levels for both subjects. In order to close the achievement gap for the ESSA subgroups and lowest 30%, all Rosemont teachers need to further build their capacity through professional learning in the areas of differentiated whole and small group instruction across content areas.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA proficiency will increase by at least 19 points to 50% on the Statewide ELA FAST PMA 3, surpassing pre-pandemic proficiency levels. Math proficiency will increase by at least 12 points to 58% on the Statewide Math FAST PMA 3. Finally, Science proficiency will increase by at least 13 points to 46% on the Statewide Science Assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

To monitor the growth in each component area, the leadership team and grade-level teams will regularly engage in data analysis of formative and summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Young (rebecca.young@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rosemont's instructional teams will continue to use the backward design strategy, meaning teacher will begin planning instructional with the end in mind. The instructional leadership team will utilize formative and summative assessment data and feedback from classroom observations to measure and monitor mastery of standards. Additionally, there will be a continued intense focus on the effective use of learning scales and summative assessment results to determine next steps for instruction and mastery of understanding of the content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for

Backward design will improve the alignment of assessment, curriculum, and instruction to build the capacity of teachers and increase student proficiency and learning gains.

selecting this strategy.**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.

The leadership team will provide classroom teachers with professional learning specifically tailored to help teachers grow in the area of lesson planning using backward-design model.

Person Responsible Rebecca Young (rebecca.young@ocps.net)

Utilize district-provided focus and assessment calendar that identifies standards to be mastered each quarter to plan, deliver, and assess learning.

Person Responsible Britany Perno (105572@ocps.net)

During common planning, instructional teams will analyze student data for the purpose of providing targeted and differentiated instruction for all students.

Person Responsible Rebecca Young (rebecca.young@ocps.net)

Administration will conduct classroom observations and provide timely, actionable feedback with an intense focus on differentiating instruction for students.

Person Responsible Rebecca Young (rebecca.young@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Student data as it relates to learning gains saw major increases in the areas of ELA and Math. ELA learning gains increased by 19 points, while Math learning gains increased by 45 points. However, the learning gains of the bottom quartile fell slightly from the year before. In order to increase learning gains we need to specifically focus on small groups that take place during extra hour and core instruction to meet students where they are and grow them on a path towards proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Although learning gains will not be calculated using the new FAST assessment, this year we will be using iReady to calculate learning gains. Our goal is to have 65% of our lowest 25 make a learning gain by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

To continue to monitor the growth in learning gains, the leadership team and grade-level teams will set learning gain goals for all students and engage in data chats with individual students to create action plans for next steps. Further, administration will provide timely and actionable feedback on portions of the day designated for small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cruz Diaz (cruz.diaz@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

To further build teacher capacity in the area of data analysis and small group implementation, administration and members of Rosemont's leadership team will provide professional learning in data goal-setting and strategic progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

As students become more aware of learning deficiencies, they can create and monitor action plans to make strides towards proficiency, by way of learning gains. Similarly, teachers and other staff members can create data-driven goals and monitor progress towards those targeted objectives.

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.

The leadership team will create, execute, and monitor flexible small groups during extra hour, core instruction, and FBS.

Person Responsible Cruz Diaz (cruz.diaz@ocps.net)

Teachers will meet weekly in grade-level PLCs to discuss student data and small group resources.

Person Responsible Rebecca Young (rebecca.young@ocps.net)

The leadership team will regularly conduct data chats with an intense focus on equity particularly for students considered in the bottom quartile and students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Cruz Diaz (cruz.diaz@ocps.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

To help support the needs of Rosemont's student population, there will be a focus on establishing a culture for social and emotional learning with adults and students. By incorporating important elements of social-emotional learning, students will grow in the areas of communication and problem-solving.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

For the 2021-2022 school year, the lowest-performing ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities, will grow by 5 points from 48% to 53% as a result of an increased focus on collaborative structures and communication skills related to social and emotional learning. To monitor the effectiveness, administration will provide timely and actionable feedback in the area of SEL/ Literacy

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administration and members of the leadership team will help incorporate elements of the CASEL 5 competencies within grade-level PLC structures. Further, administrators will evaluate elements of SEL within the Marzano framework when evaluating teacher's instructional practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

To help improve Rosemont's overall delivery and monitoring of social emotional learning, administrators will work with teachers on creating and monitoring a school-wide system for embedding SEL elements within reading and other content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

SELL (Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership) are core competencies that focus on intrapersonal, interpersonal, and decision making that integrates academics and social and emotional learning.

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.

The leadership team will monitor school-wide data related to Social and Emotional Learning through the district-wide Cogna platform.

Person Responsible

Sandra Talpade (sandra.talpade@ocps.net)

The leadership team will embed important elements of the SEL core competencies into grade-level professional learning communities.

Person Responsible

Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

Administrators will evaluate and provide targeted and actionable SEL feedback to teachers using the Marzano framework.

Person Responsible Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

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

After reviewing progress monitoring data from the 2021-2022 school year, it was determined that a critical area for improvement at Rosemont Elementary School is ELA Proficiency. This was chosen as an area of focus based on the low percentage of students achieving proficiency (48%) and the amount of improvement needed in order for most of the students to attain grade level performance.

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

After reviewing 2021-2022 FSA data as well as all available progress monitoring data from the 2021-2022 school year, it was determined that a critical area for improvement at Rosemont Elementary School is ELA Proficiency. This was chosen as an area of focus based on the low percentage of students achieving proficiency (31%) and the amount of improvement needed in order for most of the students to attain grade level performance.

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)

52% of all students in grades K-2 will demonstrate proficiency as evidenced by the Spring FAST 2022 administration.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of all students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency as evidenced by the Spring FAST 2022 administration.

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.

Teachers will engage in data analysis using the Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 FAST assessments, iReady diagnostic assessment results, as well as common assessments to determine how much growth is needed for each student on subsequent administrations. K-2 teachers will establish growth goals within FAST and i-Ready. Teachers in grades 3-5 will using previous iReady diagnostic to FSA correlations for proficiency, as well as analyzing FAST progress monitoring data. Student progress toward meeting the established goals will be analyzed after PM2 and the middle of the year and end of year diagnostics. Intermittent growth monitoring assessments will also be used. The MTSS framework will be tightened to ensure accountability for tracking, analyzing, and responding to intervention data. Meetings to discuss student progress within the tiers will be scheduled at the beginning of the school year to ensure the process is followed with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ellis, Amanda, amanda.ellis@ocps.net

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?

To help achieve the K-5 intended outcomes in reading, Rosemont will place an intense focus on small group instruction. Teachers, in collaboration with Corrective Programs and school-based leadership team will ensure that small group instruction is deliberate and focused on the following foundational reading skills.

K-3- Phonics, fluency, and vocabulary

4-5- Vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension

Based on the beginning of the year universal screener, teachers in grades K-5 will use the Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) during the reading intervention block.

Rosemont's school-based administrators will actively monitor teacher implementation of evidence-based strategies. Additionally, timely and actionable feedback will be provided to ensure the effectiveness of implementation (strong, moderate or promising).

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?

Increasing proficiency through high-quality instruction is a research-based practice linked to increases in student proficiency when coupled with effective pedagogical practices.

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
Teachers will engage in effective common planning in the area of ELA as led by the Corrective Programs Program Specialist over ELA and school-based administration to include planning and delivery of effective tier I instruction.	Diaz, Cruz, cruz.diaz@ocps.net
Daily classroom walkthroughs will be completed in all grades to ensure the transference from planning to delivery of ELA instruction.	Ellis, Amanda, amanda.ellis@ocps.net
Ongoing daily feedback, coupled with coaching supports, will be provided to all teachers to ensure effective ELA instructional delivery.	Ellis, Amanda, amanda.ellis@ocps.net

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.

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 that 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.

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

The Parent and Family Engagement Plan outlines how families can participate in various academic and informational parent events hosted by the school. Parents are encouraged to be active in their children's education through being involved in SAC, PTA, and the ADDition's Volunteer Program. Events that are hosted at Rosemont Elementary include math and science night, literacy night, and other curriculum and celebratory events. These events/initiatives are led and monitored by Rosemont's Parent Engagement Liaison as well as the school advisory council and Parent-Teacher-Association members.