Marion County Public Schools

Romeo Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Romeo Elementary School

19550 SW 36TH ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission at Romeo Elementary is to support the Marion County Public School system in developing successful citizens. Romeo Elementary will provide all students with the opportunity to achieve their personal best through building good character, learning to respect themselves and others, accepting responsibility for their actions, and developing a perpetual love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Romeo Elementary provides all children with the opportunity to explore and develop to their fullest potential.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Houle, Jennifer	Principal	The school principal serves as the instructional leader by providing professional learning opportunities for teachers aligned to standards based instruction. The principal also facilitates the school's collaborative planning sessions and builds opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional rounds to foster professional growth and development. The principal provides feedback to teachers to improve standards-based instruction. She also tracks district and school data. The principal also oversees the leadership team and delegates tasks such as coaching, data collection, and specified collaborative planning processes, and other duties as assigned.
Fennewald, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal works with the leadership team to support teachers in both planning and implementing instruction aligned to the standards. the assistant principal also facilitates the school's collaborative planning sessions and supports opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional rounds to foster professional growth and development. The assistant principal provides feedback to teachers to improve standards-based instruction and disaggregates data. She also assist teachers in understanding how to use data from summative and formative assessments to plan instruction. She is the leader in managing instructional materials for teachers. The assistant principal supports our ESOL students by training and scheduling ESOL paraprofessionals effectively to support students.
Crowder, Stacie	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Crowder is the math and science coach or content area specialist (CAS). She models standards-based math and science lessons for teachers and assists teachers in the implementation of standards based lessons. The Math/Science CAS also assists in progress monitoring both instruction and student progress in the areas of math and science while providing support in the implementation of professional development initiatives. In addition, she supports math interventions and assists in monitoring the fidelity of these interventions. The math/science CAS also designs and implements targeted professional development for teachers in the areas of math and science. She serves as a resource and point person for collaborative planning in both the areas of math and science. The math/science CAS also works alongside district science program specialists to assist teachers in planning and implementing hands-on science lessons.
Williams, Susan	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Williams is the literacy coach or content area specialist (CAS) for reading. She models standards-based reading lessons for teachers and assists teachers in the implementation of standards-based lessons. The literacy CAS also progress monitors both instruction and student progress in the area of reading while providing support in the implementation of professional development initiatives. In addition, she supports reading interventions and assists in monitoring the fidelity of interventions. The literacy CAS also designs and implements targeted professional development for teachers in the area of reading. She serves as a resource and point person for collaborative planning in both the areas of ELA and social studies.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Deneau, Ashley	School Counselor	The school counselor develops a cohesive guidance plan to support school initiatives while safeguarding the social, emotional, and mental health of students. She provides support to small groups as well as individuals and works in partnership with Romeo families to address the needs of the whole child. The school counselor tracks student data to ensure adequate progress is made with students. She also partners with local community organizations to provided needed goods and services to Romeo families
Farrow, Billy	Dean	The dean supports systems that facilitate a safe and orderly environment where all students can learn safely. She monitors discipline data, provides follow-up mentoring for students, leads our PBIS team, and ensures students feel safe. The dean provides behavior instruction and often models classroom management practices for teachers who need assistance in this area.
Wagner, Maria	School Counselor	The school counselor develops a cohesive guidance plan to support school initiatives while safeguarding the social, emotional, and mental health of students. She provides support to small groups as well as individuals and works in partnership with Romeo families to address the needs of the whole child. The school counselor tracks student data to ensure adequate progress is made with students. She also partners with local community organizations to provided needed goods and services to Romeo families

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Staff had the opportunity to review and provide input in the development of the SIP based on previous years goals. That input was then used to develop and create the current year's SIP. The SIP is also shared during SAC meetings and reviewed.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be reviewed at the quarterly SAC meetings. Members of the SAC will have the opportunity to see what our status is towards meeting our goals. Based on data from state testing, revisions will be made as needed.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	56	46	35	53	26	36	0	0	0	252
One or more suspensions	7	2	5	9	4	10	0	0	0	37
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	6	4	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	6	4	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	57	43	27	0	0	0	127
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	43	36	38	0	0	0	117
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	29	41	57	0	0	0	0	0	145

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	22	17	48	43	17	43	0	0	0	190

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	72	50	59	66	50	71	0	0	0	368
One or more suspensions	2	8	15	12	9	28	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	15	7	31	26	11	11	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	13	3	28	15	5	7	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	54	28	44	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	44	12	42	0	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	23	4	0	0	0	0	0	28

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	18	8	40	29	13	26	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	72	50	59	66	50	71	0	0	0	368
One or more suspensions	2	8	15	12	9	28	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	15	7	31	26	11	11	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	13	3	28	15	5	7	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	54	28	44	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	44	12	42	0	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	23	4	0	0	0	0	0	28

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	18	8	40	29	13	26	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37			39	47	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				50	56	61	43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51	51	52	42		
Math Achievement*	44			54	54	60	52		
Math Learning Gains				64	62	64	60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55	52	55	79		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	38			36	42	51	28		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	49			59			53		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	209
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	2	1
ELL	28	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	52			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	37			44			38					49
SWD	18			18							4	26
ELL	18			40			20				5	49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	54			46							2	
HSP	31			42			32				5	49
MUL	38			63							2	
PAC												
WHT	40			44			49				4	
FRL	34			42			35				5	49

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	39	50	51	54	64	55	36					59
SWD	21	45	53	21	45	42	6					25
ELL	32	52	47	57	64	67	21					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	40	52	58	56	61	62	28					59
MUL	28	38		56	57							
PAC												
WHT	39	51	50	53	68	50	42					
FRL	36	49	51	53	62	54	31					54

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	42	43	42	52	60	79	28					53
SWD	18	40	36	32	38		7					91
ELL	31	47		48	70		19					53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	54			38								
HSP	36	44	46	51	61	69	20					53
MUL	68			50	40		70					
PAC												
WHT	41	43	36	56	67		28					
FRL	36	39	40	51	65	76	25					48

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	49%	-7%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	48%	-12%	58%	-22%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	39%	1%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	48%	1%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	53%	-16%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	43%	-7%	51%	-15%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The area that showed the lowest performance from the subject areas that were assessed was Science. In addition to Science, our 4th grade students showed the lowest performance in both math and reading. In grades 3,4,5, 4th consistently performed the lowest in both areas. 36% of 4th grade students were proficient in reading and 36% of 4th grade students were proficient in math. Lack of understanding of the benchmark and teaching to the depth of the standard contributed to this. The 4th grade team was also had several teachers who were brand new to the profession or within their first years of teaching a class of students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

This past years lowest performing area was in math. We saw a significant decline in the number of students deemed proficient as measured by the state FAST. 46% of students in 3rd-5th grade were proficient in math. Learning new benchmarks, curriculum, and assessments, contributed to the decline in math scores.The lack of an established MTSS block for math is also a contribution to lower scores.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap compared to the state average occurred in 4th grade ELA and Math. The 4th grade ELA proficiency at Romeo as measured by PM3 on FAST was at 36% as compared to the state at 57%. The 4th grade Math proficiency at Romeo as measured by PM3 on FAST was at 36% as compared to the state at 61%. When looking at the same cohort of students that were previously 3rd graders, they made an increase in reading proficiency but still declined overall in math. Students lack the foundational skills in math with contributes to the overall low math proficiency. In addition, Romeo had several new to the teaching profession or 4th grade on the team.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The third grade data in ELA and math showed improvement with the most improvement being in 3rd grade ELA. A well defined MTSS block with constant progress monitoring and drilling down to student need contributed to the overall increase in proficient students in 3rd grade. The MTSS block for ELA occurred at 7:55 and all students in 3rd-5th grade were placed in an intervention or enrichment groups that focused directly on the skill deficit. The increase of staff available to assist with MTSS groups created smaller numbers and ability to monitor and impact instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

1. Number of students performing at a level 1.
2. Student Absenteeism

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase proficiency in reading.
2. Increase proficiency in math.
3. Increase attendance.
4. Increase performance in the SWD subgroup (Romeo will have 4 self contained units this year, in addition to the students that receive services in the gen. ed classroom).
5. Increase proficiency in Science.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Analysis of district and state assessment indicates a need to build lessons that are more closely aligned to the rigor of the B.E.S.T. standards in the core content areas of ELA and Math. In addition to building the lessons, the delivery of the content will incorporate high yield strategies that are shown to increase student performance. The tasks for students with disabilities will also be looked at to ensure individual achievement goals are being incorporated and UDL strategies are being used. Student performance data from 2021, 2022, and 2023 in inconsistent with data rising and falling from year to year. An adjustment of Tier 1 instruction to align consistently with the standards so students are prepared to demonstrate mastery.

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

A focus on rigorous, aligned content that is differentiated using high yield strategies will result in an overall proficiency increase of 5% in ELA and Math on the 2024 FAST statewide assessment.

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

Teachers will utilize well-planned lessons and execute instruction of rigorous standards based tasks allowing for differentiation of mastery with weekly checks for understanding and other formative assessment data to adjust instruction based on student need. The content area specialists will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and checks for understanding. Administrator walkthroughs and debriefs will also provide data to support implementation. The year long professional development plan will incorporate high yield strategies that will be implemented and observed as monthly targets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will collaboratively plan using standards based resources to develop standard aligned tasks, formative assessments, and small group instruction.Teachers will plan these lessons in collaborative planning twice per week with content area specialists and administration. Modeling, work samples, and classroom walks will be a part of the overall process of implementation and understanding. This process will be regularly monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that both formative assessment and collaborative planning are high yield evidence based strategies. Teachers will utilize research based high yield strategies when planning and delivering instruction. Explicit and rigorous tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development to assist them in the implementation of identified high yield strategies in the classroom. This resource will aid in the design of standards based instruction that is accessible to all students and will lead to an overall increase of proficiency.

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

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year with PD that will occur monthly and then followed up in the weekly collaborative planning sessions.

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

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

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year with weekly collaborative planning sessions.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on state achievement data in the area of Science, only 36% of tested students are proficient in Science. This data remained unchanged from the previous school year. This is below the district and state average. Students will disabilities are performing low and will receive support based on individual IEP goals to make progress towards standards mastery.

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

With explicit science instruction and vocabulary building, Science proficiency scores will increase by 5% as measured by the state science assessment.

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

Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. During classroom walkthroughs of science instruction, student engagement and vocabulary will be noted by administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

K-5 teachers will collaboratively plan standards based lessons that incorporate science vocabulary building opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Science standards are not all reciprocal creating gaps in a student's science knowledge and understanding from one grade level to the next. With an emphasis on science vocabulary building in all grades and access to hands on learning opportunities, students will have the background knowledge needed to prove proficiency on the 5th grade state science assessment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

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

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

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year.

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

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

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student attendance directly impacts student achievement. Each day a student arrives to school late or misses a day of school, valuable instruction is lost. Students with excessive absences typically perform lower on class, district, and state assessments. The attendance of students with disabilities impacts achievement of individual learning goals.

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

With schoolwide and individual incentives, the schoolwide daily attendance rate at Romeo will increase by 3% as measured by Skyward attendance reports.

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

With collaboration between the home school liaision and school counselors, the daily attendance will be monitored. The percent of students present each day will be shared on the morning show and on a board in the front office. Support Facilitators and ESE teachers will assist promoting attendance and reaching out to parents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Deneau (ashley.deneau@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Parent Communication will be used in the implementation of this area of focus. Parents/guardians will receive phone calls, letters, and have face to face meetings to address attendance concerns.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building relationships with the families at Romeo will help increase open communication and support in attendance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Students that are identified as having chronic attendance issues will be set up on an attendance plans and receive incentives for attending school. Parents will also be notified of attendance concerns.

Person Responsible: Ashley Deneau (ashley.deneau@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Share the daily attendance rate and our goal on the morning show for all students to hear. 3 names will also be drawn on the morning show. If the students are present, they will receive a book out of the book vending machine.

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

By When: daily

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Each SAC meeting will review the school improvement plan along with any funding allocations. This will ensure any expenditures are directly linked to the needs of the students.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

In the 2023 school year, grades K-2 produced the following data on ELA/PM3-
Kindergarten-54% at or above the benchmark
1st grade-46% at or above the benchmark
2nd grade-45% at or above the benchmark

The emphasis on instruction during the 2022-2023 school year for Kindergarten through second grade students was in foundational skills, specifically in phonics. Students were screened and placed in intervention groups based on specific deficits in reading.In addition to intervention programs, all students were receiving explicit phonics instruction. In addition to teaching foundational skills, emphasis must be placed on the comprehension instruction to support the benchmark. Teachers must use the data to guide small group instruction and align the tasks presented to the students. Teachers will breakdown the comprehension benchmarks during collaborative planning to ensure that the tasks given to students align with the depth of the benchmark.

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

In the 2023 school year, grades 3-5 produced the following data on ELA/PM3-
3rd grade- 41% at or above the benchmark
4th grade- 38% at or above the benchmark
5th grade- 42% at or above the benchmark

During collaborative planning, teachers will focus on breaking down each benchmark to ensure that students are receiving instruction aligned to the benchmark. This includes looking at the specific verbs in the benchmark and determining what the teacher will do, what the student will do, what will be the evidence of student learning, and how the benchmark will be assessed. Teachers will incorporate strategies and structures to to reach the depth of the standard. This will also include modeling of what it looks like and sounds like in a classroom.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

If teachers teach to the depth of the standard and use data to make decisions, the following increases in overall proficiency will occur:
Kindergarten-54% in 2023 to 59% in 2024
1st grade-46% in 2023 to 51% in 2024
2nd grade-45% in 2023 to 50% in 2024

This will be measured by the PM3 STAR assessment in 2024 as compared to the PM3 STAR assessment in 2023 in each grade level. This is in comparison to the same grade level of students but not the same cohort of students.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If teachers teach to the depth of the standard and use data to make decisions, the following increase in overall proficiency will occur:
3rd grade-41% in 2023 to 46% in 2024
4th grade-38% in 2023 to 43% in 2024
5th grade-42% in 2023 to 47% in 2024

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The areas of focus will be monitored using state Assessment and Progress Monitoring data as well as district data. Data will be reviewed and analyzed with each grade level as assessments are given to determine areas that need to be remediated or retaught for mastery. The data will also be used with creating small groups in the classroom and intervention groups during MTSS. Teachers will continue to monitor student achievement and adjust instruction accordingly. The reading content area specialist will help in facilitating the planning of the instruction with support from administration. Administration will also walk classrooms to observe instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Williams, Susan, susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

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

Teachers and paraprofessionals will receive ongoing professional development and support in using data to guide instruction. Students in K-2 will continue to receive explicit phonics instruction using UFLI. Students in 3rd grade needing additional foundational support in phonics will also receive instruction in UFLI as an intervention. Students will continue to be screened for reading deficits and placed in the appropriate intervention program.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

UFLI is a research based program and will be used with fidelity in all Kindergarten, 1st, and 2nd grade classrooms. The beginning of each reading block in the above mentioned grade levels will include all components of UFLI and implemented with fidelity. The reading content area specialist will monitor and model lessons in kindergarten through second grade classrooms. Elements of UFLI will also be incorporated into small group instruction.

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching: The Reading Content Area Specialist will work with teachers during collaborative planning twice a week. During this time the CAS will work with teachers to plan instruction that is aligned to the depth of the benchmark. In addition to planning the instruction, the CAS will support with the delivery of the lesson by modeling and facilitating conversation of what the instruction looks like-the delivery. The CAS will also coach and model for teachers the UFLI lessons during collaborative planning and in the classroom as needed.	Williams, Susan, susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership: Administration will work with the reading Content Area Specialist to review upcoming benchmarks, assessments, and resources, prior to collaborative planning. Observation data from classroom walkthroughs will also be looked at to determine next steps in planning and implementation of reading instruction.	Houle, Jennifer, jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us
Assessment: When collaboratively planning, teachers will review classroom and district formative assessments to identify need for reteach and or remediation based on data and trends. The progress monitoring tool from the state will be used to adjust intervention groups and plan for benchmark mastery. Teachers will receive support and guidance from the content area specialist and administration to desegregate data and plan instruction.	Williams, Susan, susan.williams@marion.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning: Instructional staff will receive on-going professional learning using pre-identified high yield strategies. Teachers will receive development and understanding of specific high yield strategies and then incorporate the high yield strategies in their lesson plans. The high yield strategies will be reviewed during faculty focus meetings and then discussed to a deeper depth for implementation during weekly collaborative planning sessions.	Houle, Jennifer, jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be posted on our school website. In addition to this, the SIP will be reviewed at our SAC meetings. At that time, the plan will verbally be explained to parents so they can understand the language and ask questions. An ESOL para will also be available to translate to families that speak Spanish.

https://www.marionschools.net/roe

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Parents can view information specific to the school at our school website. In addition to the website, flyers with information will be shared via Class DOJO, hard paper copy, and email. There will also be weekly callouts "Pioneer Connection" that will be completed by the principal to inform parents of upcoming events and opportunities to participate in their child's learning. Parent nights are also planned to be scheduled at places in the local community where our students play, live, and or worship.
https://www.marionschools.net/roe

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Through collaborative planning and the use of high yield strategies the academic programs will increase in proficiency at Romeo. This planning will involve modeling lessons, visiting classrooms, and reviewing work samples to ensure that we are optimizing and capitalizing on learning opportunities.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This section is not applicable at this time.