

Lake County Schools

Rimes Early Learning & Literacy Center



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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rimes Early Learning & Literacy Center

3101 SCHOOLVIEW ST, Leesburg, FL 34748

<https://rel.lake.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Dominique Ward

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2000

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-2
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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: No Grade 2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Lake 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rimes Early Learning & Literacy Center

3101 SCHOOLVIEW ST, Leesburg, FL 34748

<https://rel.lake.k12.fl.us>

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-2	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	71%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12	2010-11
Grade		

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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 Rimes Early Learning and Literacy Center is to provide every student opportunities to excel socially and academically.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A dynamic, progressive and collaborative learning community embracing change and diversity where every student will graduate with the skills needed to succeed in post secondary education and the workplace.

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
Ward, Dominique	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To establish a safe and welcoming environment. This collaborative attitude enables us to meet the challenges of academic excellence in a positive, fun, and nurturing way. *Oversee, evaluate, provide assistance and give meaningful feedback in a timely manner as an instructional leader for instructional and non-instructional staff *Maintain compliance with state and federal policies and guidelines *Oversee data chats of progress monitoring for both academics and behavior *Facilitate collaborative team meetings, faculty meetings, and leadership meetings *Assists in the implementation of the safety plan and safety drills *Oversees budget *Discipline *Learning walks *Attends and participates in Penguin Pride/SAC
Gilbert, Stephanie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Set the tone for ensuring a guaranteed viable curriculum with a focus on improved learning for adults and students alike *provide coaching and mentoring with standards and instructional practices. Support teachers guaranteeing all instruction is aligned to the standard. Collaborate, observe, and give meaningful feedback in a timely manner *Data Chats *Collaborative Planning facilitator *Textbook Manager *Learning Walks *Title I Inventory *MTSS team *Testing Coordinator *Math Family Night *Small group interventionist *Title 1 Tutoring Facilitator
Simmons, Paige	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Set the tone for ensuring a guaranteed viable curriculum with a focus on improved learning for adults and students alike *Provide coaching and mentoring with standards aligned instructional practices. Support teachers guaranteeing all instruction is aligned to the standards. Facilitate, collaborate, and observe through planning and learning walks. *Collaborative planning facilitator *Master schedule *Monthly data chats *MTSS coordinator *Small group interventionist (SIPPS/LLI) *Testing coordinator *TEAM Expert *Literacy Night, Literacy Week, Read Across America Week, Superintendent's Reading Challenge

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vachon, Melanie	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *set tone to ensure a guaranteed viable curriculum that contribute to the goal of improved learning for adults and students alike *Provide coaching mentoring with BEST standards or IEP Goals and highly effective instructional practices. Support teachers guaranteeing all instructional is aligned to the standards. Collaborate, observe, and give meaningful feedback in a timely manner. *MTSS team *Monthly data chats *ESE Coordinator/Support *IEP/504 coordinator *Learning Walks *ESE pre-k and VPK collaborative planning facilitator *New teacher induction team
Widmann, Amy	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Textbook Manager Interventionist Teacher Assistant PLT leader Morning News Inventory
Yox, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	kindergarten teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2000, Dominique Ward

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

270

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

2

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	65	46	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	8	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/27/2022

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	57	55	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
Attendance below 90 percent	12	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	57	55	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
Attendance below 90 percent	12	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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		50%	56%					58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains								57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								49%	53%
Math Achievement		46%	50%					60%	63%
Math Learning Gains								56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								39%	51%
Science Achievement		52%	59%					54%	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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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
ELL											
FRL											
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
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

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	73
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	73
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	70
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?

I-Ready end of year reading data in ELA showed that students performed lowest in the following areas:

*kindergarten: high frequency words and phonics (71% and 72% proficiency respectively)

*first grade: vocabulary and phonics (57% and 50% proficiency respectively)

*second grade: vocabulary and phonics (26% and 40% proficiency respectively)

I-Ready end of the year math data showed the following:

*kindergarten: Algebra and Algebraic Thinking (55% proficient)

*first grade: numbers and operations, geometry (52% and 54% proficient)

*second grade: numbers and operations, geometry (38% and 38% proficient)

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

ELA data demonstrates the greatest need for improvement in phonics (54% overall proficiency). Math data demonstrates the most need for improvement for numbers and operations (45% 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?

The contributing factors correlate with teacher turnover in first and second grade along with a the implementation of the new reading series. This year we will start with a full instructional staff trained in the new ELA and math curriculums.

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

Based on I-Ready end of the year data presented above, the areas of most improvement in ELA were phonological awareness and high frequency words. Math data showed the most improvement in measurement and data.

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

ELA improvements were due to the Foundations curriculum implemented in k-2. Additionally, we put in place "walk to" intervention/acceleration block. The SIPPS literacy program was used during the intervention block emphasizing and explicitly teaching phonological awareness.

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

The 2022-2023 school year will introduce a new math series to our teachers. Along with the implementation of the math series, we will be adding a "walk to" math intervention/acceleration block. We will continue to strengthen our ELA supports to include a professional learning team of paraprofessionals led by our media specialist/interventionist. This PLT will strengthen will our students supports as we strengthen our adult learning and understanding.

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.

Reveal Math PD- an overview of newly adopted math curriculum
I-Ready PD- to better analyze data from progress monitoring assessments
SIPPS training- intervention strategies for phonics and phonological awareness
Insights to Behavior PD

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

Learning walks by leadership team to check for alignment with District Instructional Framework, Professional Learning Team discussion based on data and results needed, Writing Teams with PLTs to better align materials and resources with essential standards.

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.

Based on i-Ready diagnostic results from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, instructional practice as it relates to standards aligned instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. This area of focus was assigned as a critical area of need because the data showed gaps in proficiency across grade levels in math. Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards-aligned instruction with a focus on guided instruction as a strategy to transfer knowledge and responsibility for learning to students by scaffolding through questioning, prompting, and cueing.

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in Math iReady end of year proficiency scores from 50% to 60%.

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

Common Formative Assessment
 Classroom Learning Walks
 PLC Data Analysis (Question 3 and 4)
 iReady Data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Teachers will continue work as a Professional Learning Communities during grade level collaborative planning time with an intense focus on student learning and results. The four PLC questions will guide the learning and work within teacher teams as they plan for standards based instruction through establishing the purpose, authentic literacy experiences and delving into instructional best practices. This will be monitored through admin participation, classroom walkthroughs and on going progress monitoring.

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

Lake County Schools is committed to becoming a Professional Learning Community school district.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Signs**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Through our PBIS System, we will foster a positive school community and culture where we are collectively committed to the success of all students. If we have high expectations and foster positive relationships, we will make Rimes ELLC a place where people are collectively committed to ensuring high levels of learning for all.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on high levels of learning for all and building positive relationships we expect to see a decrease in the number of students with more than 10% absenteeism from 46% to 30%.

Monitoring:

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

EWS data- absenteeism report

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Fostering positive relationships, rewarding and recognizing student attendance, and communicating with families regularly will help decrease the number of absent students.

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

Fostering positive relationships, rewarding and recognizing student attendance, and communicating with families regularly will increase the number of students regularly attending school.

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 and staff will continue the implementation of the PBIS STAR Penguin framework to implement in all classrooms. Additionally, teachers will be trained in Sanford Harmony during prepalnning. Having a common language across campus will help to set positive expectations for student behaviors as well as build relationships.

When: 8/10/2022 - 6/7/2023

Frequency: Weekly

Evidence: Classroom Learning Environment, Learning Walks, Student Feedback, stakeholder surveys

Person Responsible

Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

School faculty and staff will reward and recognize student attendance daily and quarterly, using the PBIS framework.

When: 8/10/2022 - 6/7/2023

Frequency: Daily recognition and quarterly rewards, family communication as needed

Evidence: Classroom Learning Environment, Learning Walks, Student Feedback, stakeholder surveys

Person Responsible

Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

Instructional staff will use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration activities to increase learning gains for all students. All students will participate in "walk to" intervention, where teachers will use research-based strategies, iReady teacher toolbox lessons, and math learning games and tools to reinforce concepts. If teachers use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration for all students, then students will receive effective feedback that will help move their understanding of essential learning targets forward.

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase Math iReady end of year proficiency scores from 50% to 60%.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored by analyzing grade level formative data (Reveal math diagnostic tools and exit tickets) aligned to essential learning targets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Analyzing and using Reveal math diagnostic tools and exit tickets to inform interventions and acceleration for math will help increase learning gains. This will be evidenced when discussing "What we will do for student who did not get it , and what we will do for those who already know it" (PLC Question 3 and 4). The progress monitoring data from the frequent common assessments and diagnostic tools will be analyzed on an ongoing basis by coaches, admin, and teachers. This data will be used to group and re-group students accordingly.

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

If teachers use ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to intervene or accelerate students then students will receive timely and effective intervention. To monitor this strategy, we will complete classroom learning walks during our intervention/enrichment block, participate in data analysis conversations with teachers and progress monitor students on the mastery of essential learning targets in math.

**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.

1. Readiness Diagnostic from Reveal math will be used to provide targeted intervention
2. Exit tickets will be used weekly to provide opportunities for flexible walk to groupings
3. Analysis will be made between Reveal tests, iReady tests and new FAST testing for inter-rater reliability between all scores

Person Responsible Stephanie Gilbert (gilberts@lake.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

Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards-aligned instruction with a focus on guided instruction as a strategy to transfer knowledge and responsibility for learning to students by scaffolding through questioning, prompting, and cueing. This will entail grade level professional learning teams analyzing student work on a weekly basis to target phonics and vocabulary instruction.

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

n/a

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)

Based on iReady diagnostic 3 data

Kindergarten spring 2022 data: 22% were not on track to score a level 3 on a statewide assessment

First grade spring 2022 data: 39% were not on track to score a level 3 on a statewide assessment

Second grade spring 2022: 57% were not on track to scores a level 3 on a statewide assessment

Rimes ELLC will expect a 5% decrease in the above percentages to show an increase in overall student proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

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.

iReady diagnostics

FAST testing

SIPPS screeners/assessments

Formative classroom assessments (Exit tickets)

Foundations tracker

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Simmons, Paige , simmonsp@lake.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?

Foundations is our core phonics program which will be utilized by all teachers. iReady is a computer program providing fall, winter, and spring progress monitoring. iReady provides students with a clear instructional pathway for remediation and/or acceleration. Finally, Rimes intervention phonics program is Systematic Instruction in Phonics, Phonological Awareness, and Sight Words (SIPPS). Students who show a deficit in these areas will receive targeted intervention with a "walk to " intervention format.

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?

All evidence based practices/programs are approved curriculum for Lake County Schools.

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
<p>Literacy Leadership meetings will be held monthly.</p> <p>Data chats will be held between teacher and administration as well as between student and teacher to provide targeted instructional feedback.</p> <p>Literacy coach will be available to observe Foundations lessons. This will entail modeling and coaching teachers who may need additional support.</p>	<p>Ward, Dominique, wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us</p>

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.

At Rimes, building and sustaining a positive school culture is a top priority to build on the success of our staff and students socially and emotionally. Whether it is with our staff, teachers, students, families, or community partners, we strive to focus on the strengths and talents that each individual brings to our campus to heighten student success.

A Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports system sustains a positive culture by celebrating the success of all stakeholders. School wide expectations are implemented and students are rewarded in various ways for following these behavioral standards. This behavior system assists teachers addressing appropriate behavior while enhancing students' social and emotional skills. One example of acknowledgement of student success is STAR Penguin tickets which are earned for positive behavior. These tickets are then collected and turned in to our PASS teacher who awards weekly classroom STAR penguins based on the data collected through ticket returns.

We communicate with our stakeholders through multiple forms of communication including School Messenger Call-Out System, Class Dojo, daily student folders, social media and the school webpage. Communication is sent in language our parents understand. Translators will be present at events to assist with communicating with our parents.

Most importantly, Rimes is a professional learning community. Collegial collaboration and learning teams provide support for our staff. These teams allow us to meet new colleagues and reconnect with known colleagues. Grade level learning teams build capacity, create collective commitments, and learn/relearn the expectations of our school and district in a shared, co-created environment.

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

The principal, Dominique Ward, will set the vision and share the plan for building a positive school culture and environment. The leadership team will monitor and communicate needed support to meet our goals. Volunteers, parents, and community members will be involved in improving school culture and environment through parent involvement, volunteering time with students and through monetary donations for incentives for both students and teachers.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) at Rimes continues to collaborate and build relationships between all stakeholders. This includes planning, reviewing, and making suggestions to assist with instructional improvement. Rimes will continue to collaborate and build relationships with community organizations, such as, local churches, businesses, food establishments, and community clubs/groups to promote a positive relationship between Rimes and our surrounding community. The collaboration and resources that stakeholders provide make an environment supportive of equity, availability, and unification.