

Orange County Public Schools

# Rolling Hills Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Rolling Hills Elementary

4903 DONOVAN ST, Orlando, FL 32808

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kimberly Hankerson**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/28/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: D (36%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Rolling Hills Elementary

4903 DONOVAN ST, Orlando, FL 32808

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>98%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	D	D	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
Hankerson, Kimberly	Principal	The principal is responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems within the school. She serves as the curriculum and instructional leader at Rolling Hills Elementary. She supports, observes, and evaluates Rolling Hills' teachers in their ability to make data-based instructional decisions to ensure everyone is upholding high expectations for student learning at all times. The principal is responsible for the safety and the social-emotional well-being of the Rolling Hills Elementary staff and students.
Camara, Jessica	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems under the direction of the principal. In addition, she serves as an instructional and curricular leader.
Brooks, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach is responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in implementing instruction PK-5.
Kelly, Carla	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist ensures all requirements and compliance items for ESE students are met, collaborates regularly with classroom teachers to support effectively identifying students with exceptionalities and/or diverse needs, and monitors ESE students' EWI signals.
Prosper, Shakeela	Other	The MTSS/Data Coach is responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in data literacy and utilizing data to make effective instructional decisions.
Scott Smith, Tameika	Math Coach	The Math Coach is responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in implementing math and science instruction PK-5.
Thompson, Keron	Dean	The Dean provides discipline support for teachers and classified personnel, oversees the mentor program for students, and implements a school-wide positive behavior system. The dean facilitates teacher training and PD to ensure the effective delivery of our school-wide behavior systems.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 6/28/2022, Kimberly Hankerson

**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.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

29

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

498

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

8

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

5

**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	29	74	59	95	69	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	12	25	25	41	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	24	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	37	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	40	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	0	13	36	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

**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	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	



**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 7/29/2022

**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	63	81	69	80	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	36	32	30	33	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	1	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

**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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	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	63	81	69	80	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	36	32	30	33	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	1	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

**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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	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	30%	56%	56%				38%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						61%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						64%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	32%	46%	50%				51%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	49%						71%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						68%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	61%	59%				56%	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	25%	55%	-30%	58%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	47%	62%	-15%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	63%	-11%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	53%	0%
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	9	30	30	13	16		33				
ELL	24	38		32	39		33				
BLK	29	48	48	30	52	45	33				
HSP	30	47		40	44		18				
FRL	26	48	46	27	48	46	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	5			20							
ELL	19	60		27	40						
BLK	25	36	55	28	17	25	26				
HSP	32			38							
FRL	24	40	58	27	26	33	26				
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	26	39		40	61						
ELL	38	66		49	72	73	43				
BLK	34	59	65	51	71	72	57				
HSP	52	67		42	65						
FRL	36	61	66	47	73	73	57				

**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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	326
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?**

Across grade levels data reveal trends in deficiencies in both reading and math foundational skills that affected both tier one and tier two core-content instruction. Thirty percent of our third, fourth, and fifth-grade students demonstrated proficiency in English Language Arts, revealing significant reading challenges which impacted learning in all other content areas.

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

Rolling Hills Elementary 2022 FSA data indicates that 30% of 3rd - 5th grade students were proficient in ELA, 32% were proficient in math, and 34% of 5th-grade students were proficient in science. The data also indicates that less than 50% of students made learning gains in ELA (49%) and math (49%). 45% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA and 39% made learning gains in math. ESSA subgroup data indicates 9% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA and 13% were proficient in math, while 30% made learning gains in reading and 15% made learning gains in math. In science, 18% of Hispanic students were proficient in science, which was 15% less than Black students. The data indicates a need to focus on standards-based planning, instruction, and learning while focusing on ESSA subgroups, particularly Hispanic students and students with disabilities.

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

The contributing factors include teacher content knowledge and pedagogical decision-making, student attendance, school-wide behavior management systems, lack of support staff, and inadequate coaching/mentoring of new teachers. New actions to address this would be strategic planning to evaluate significant needs and identification of effective strategies for support; these actions would then need to be implemented and consistently monitored.

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

Math learning gains went from 22% to 49%, English Language Arts learning gains went from 39% to 49%, and science improved by 9%.

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

The math intervention block was added to the daily master schedule and this contributed to the 27% increase in math learning gains.

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

Strategic, targeted, intense interventions will need to be organized and implemented immediately to address student needs in order to accelerate learning.

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

Professional development opportunities will begin during pre-planning and are consistently offered throughout the school year prioritizing MTSS/Data training, strategies that support meeting students' literacy needs, using data to drive instruction, and diagnosing and prescribing reading interventions.

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

Additional services include support facilitation in general education classrooms for students who receive ESE services, ongoing mentoring and coaching of classroom teachers, and consistent professional development and training based on teachers' areas for growth.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**

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

Rolling Hills Elementary 2022 FSA data reveal 18% of Hispanic students were proficient in science, which was 15% less than Black students. The data indicates a need to focus on standards-based planning, instruction, and learning while focusing on ESSA subgroups, particularly Hispanic students.

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

By focusing on standards-based planning, instruction, and learning and increasing proficiency in all qualifying ESSA subgroups, with an intense focus on Hispanic students, we will increase our percentage of students who are proficient on the 2023 ELA FAST assessment to 42% (+12%) and math to 49% (+17%). We will increase our percentage of students scoring at proficiency or higher on the 2023 FSA science assessment to 49% (+15%). We will increase our proficiency for Hispanic students to 40% (+22%) for science.

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

Students will be identified and systematically monitored throughout the school year. Content-area and MTSS coaches will organize and collect data utilizing the F.A.S.T progress monitoring assessments, standards-based unit assessments, as well as classroom formative assessments to inform admin of student progress toward identified goals.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

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

Research-based learning strategies will be utilized to support our Hispanic students, who are enrolled in our English Language Learner program, in their understanding of science concepts as well as focusing on developing literacy skills to support comprehension of scientific texts. Learning strategies include the use of concept maps and graphic organizers, note-taking strategies, and explicit vocabulary instruction.

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

The mentioned strategies are scientifically-proven learning strategies based on studies referenced in John Hattie's (2008) "Visible 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.

Strategic planning by leadership team members for implementation and follow-through.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

Provide professional development and resources to the appropriate teachers on the identified strategies and plan for implementation.

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Brooks (stephanie.brooks@ocps.net)

Model and monitor the implementation of the plan and identified strategies. Provide ongoing feedback to teachers on their instruction and student learning occurring. Work with the school district to advocate for, or obtain, the necessary resources and support for successful implementation.

**Person Responsible** Tameika Scott Smith (tameikam.scottsmith@ocps.net)

Monitor coaching support, teacher planning, and student learning as a result of the implementation and use of strategies.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Camara (jessica.camara@ocps.net)

Consistent progress monitoring of student data and evaluation of plan's effectiveness. Utilize classroom walkthrough data to determine trends and next steps.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**

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

Rolling Hills Elementary 2022 FSA data indicates that 30% of 3rd - 5th grade students were proficient in ELA, 32% were proficient in math, and 34% of 5th grade students were proficient in science. The data also indicates that less than 50% of students made learning gains in ELA (49%) and math (49%). 45% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA and 39% made learning gains in math. ESSA subgroup data indicates 9% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA and 13% were proficient in math, while 30% made learning gains in reading and 15% made learning gains in math. In science 18% of Hispanic students were proficient in science, which was 15% less than Black students. The data indicates a need to focus on standards-based planning, instruction, and learning while focusing on ESSA subgroups, particularly Hispanic students and students with disabilities.

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

By focusing on standards-based planning, instruction, and learning and increasing proficiency in all qualifying ESSA subgroups, with an intense focus on Spanish students and students with disabilities, we will increase our percentage of students who are proficient on the 2023 ELA FAST assessment to 42% (+12%) and math to 49% (+17%). We will increase our percentage of students scoring at proficiency or higher on the 2023 FSSA science assessment to 49% (+15%). We will increase our proficiency for students with disabilities to 35% (+26%) for ELA and 45% (32%) and Spanish students to 40% (+22%) for science.

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

Classroom walkthrough data pertaining to standards-based instruction and student unit assessment data will be consistently monitored and analyzed in data PLCs throughout the school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

With the implementation of common planning focused on developing teacher knowledge of B.E.S.T benchmark-focused instruction, we will utilize ongoing formative assessments and mass distributed practice to support this area of focus.

**implemented for this Area of Focus.**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

Ongoing guided practice with immediate feedback, and independent student practice consistently over time supports long-term retention of information. These strategies support the cognitive skills necessary for effective learning.

**Describe the resources/ criteria used for 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.

Strategic planning among leadership team members for implementation.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

Implement common planning with a focus on the new B.E.S.T. benchmarks appropriate for each content area and provide teachers with the tools and knowledge necessary for classroom instruction. Identify ongoing formative assessments for ongoing progress monitoring and plan's effectiveness.

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Brooks (stephanie.brooks@ocps.net)

Facilitate bi-weekly data PLCs to support teachers' data literacy skills and implement data-informed instructional decisions.

**Person Responsible** Shakeela Prosper (shakeela.prosper-lammie@ocps.net)

Reevaluate the plan's implementation, monitor common planning and PLCs for coaching support and mentoring, observe classroom instruction and provide ongoing feedback.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Camara (jessica.camara@ocps.net)

Review the area of focus and evaluate the student learning outcomes to determine the overall effective and considerations for revisions.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@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

End-of-Year i-Ready diagnostic data indicated an average of 35% of students in K-2nd grade performed on grade level in reading. Differentiated instruction with a focus on foundational reading skills will be implemented and monitored within small group reading instruction. The district-provided foundational assessments will be utilized to progress monitor.

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

As indicated by the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment, 30% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher in ELA. Differentiated instruction with a focus on foundational reading skills will be implemented and monitored within small group reading instruction. Tier 2 reading intervention data will be utilized to progress monitor student 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)

The statewide FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment 3 (PMA 3) will demonstrate an increase in overall percentage of students on grade level from 35% to 50% in kindergarten through second grade.

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

The statewide FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment 3 (PMA 3) will demonstrate an increase in overall percentage of students on grade level from 30% to 55% in third through fifth grade.

#### **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.

Members of the school leadership team will conduct weekly reading walkthroughs to collect trend data specific to instructional practices utilized within the ELA block in all grade levels. FAST Progress Monitoring assessments 1 and 2 (PM 1, PM 2) will be tracked to create fluid instructional groups of students for differentiated Tier I and Tier II instruction. District-created standards-based unit assessments will be utilized to monitor student performance on grade level benchmarks. Coaching cycles will be conducted with teachers in areas of greatest need to monitor and support the utilization of reading best practices and alignment to grade level standards.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Camara, Jessica, [jessica.camara@ocps.net](mailto:jessica.camara@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?

Through use of district approved and provided resources, research based practices will be implemented in all grade levels. Identified areas of need in foundational reading skills will be supported through the use of programs such as Heggerty and SIPPS. Common planning sessions, facilitated by the Instructional Coach, will focus on embedding Science of Reading components within all levels of instruction.

#### **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?

In grades kindergarten through second grade, the Heggerty program will be utilized to address phonological awareness skills. Students in grades K-5 are screened in the SIPPS program for accurate placement within lessons on the reading continuum. A strong focus will be placed on supporting students in decoding words, analyzing word parts through morphology, and applying phonics skills within leveled texts. Small group instruction will support the differentiated needs of students based on fluid groupings and progress monitoring.

**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
Weekly classroom visits conducted by the school leadership team, to collect and analyze trend data within reading instructional practices.	Hankerson, Kimberly, kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net
Literacy leadership team meetings with representatives of multiple grade levels to analyze data, create action steps, and monitor implementation.	Camara, Jessica, jessica.camara@ocps.net
Instructional coach attends district coach meetings and utilizes data to identify areas of need and coaching cycle opportunities. Support includes modeling, facilitating common planning and PLCs, and facilitates grade level data discussions.	Brooks, Stephanie, stephanie.brooks@ocps.net
Data points collected, monitored, and analyzed: District created Standards-Based Unit Assessments, FAST Progress Monitoring assessments (PM 1, 2, and 3), Reading Plus lesson progression and growth, i-Ready diagnostic growth (BOY to MOY), SIPPS Mastery Assessments and formative assessments.	Prosper, Shakeela, shakeela.prosper-lammie@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.**

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social-skills learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will use social and emotional learning strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, we will use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative to support student success. The outcome of this initiative will be measured, in part, by the district-wide Panorama platform survey distributed to all stakeholders in order to measure the impact that school initiatives and climate have on culture and sense of belonging in each school.

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

A core team of teachers and administrators from our school, including a mental health designee, will participate in this district-wide professional learning through the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Our school will also use our Parent Engagement Liaison to bridge the community and school culture.