Rosemont Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Rosemont Elementary

4650 POINT LOOK OUT RD, Orlando, FL 32808

https://rosemontes.ocps.net/

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.

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, 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
Diaz, Cruz	Principal	Mr. Diaz, principal of Rosemont Elementary, is responsible for the overall functioning of the school and data for all grade levels. Mr. Diaz attends and facilitates Data/Multi-Tier Support Systems and Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings. Mr. Diaz monitors both lesson plans and classroom instruction through observations to ensure standards-based instruction and tasks are aligned to the standards. He provides actionable feedback to increase both teacher and student growth. Mr. Diaz communicates on a consistent manner with the stakeholders of the school be it parents, community members, business partners or district level staff.
Young, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	In the role of Assistant Principal, Rebecca Young participates in the ongoing process of progress monitoring of student achievement data. She is part of Multi-Tier Support System team working with teachers to identify strategies both academic and behavioral to meet student needs. Mrs. Young monitors the effectiveness of classroom instruction and provides actionable feedback to teachers which includes observing, coaching, and evaluating. Mrs. Young attends Math PLC meetings and supports the instructional coach and resource staff.
Burgess, Sheleen	Assistant Principal	In the role of Assistant Principal, Mrs. Burgess-Kennedy participates in the ongoing process of progress monitoring of student achievement data. She is part of the Multi-Tier Support System team working with teachers to identify strategies both academic and behavioral to meet student needs. Mrs. Burgess-Kennedy monitors the effectiveness of classroom instruction and provides actionable feedback to teachers which includes observing, coaching, and evaluating. Mrs. Burgess-Kennedy attends ELA PLC meetings and supports the instructional coach and resource staff.
Perno, Britany	Curriculum Resource Teacher	In her role as CRT and Instructional Coach, Ms. Perno utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in best practices for delivering standards-based instruction. She participates in grade level professional learning communities and provides mentoring and professional development to build teacher capacity.
Thomas, Carolyn	Dean	In her role as dean and behavioral MTTS support, Ms. Thomas will ensure that teachers, staff members, and students are following our school-wide behavioral plan that includes CHAMPS and Caring School Communities. This will ensure that we support a culture of engagement, responsibility, and safety. Additionally, Ms. Thomas will support the creation of systems that will contribute to our school-wide social-emotional learning goals and Positive Behavioral Interventions Systems.
Norman, Deborah	Teacher, ESE	In her role as SLD teacher at Rosemont Elementary School, Mrs. Norman is responsible for working with our ESE students to meet their IEP goals. Mrs. Norman also works closely with the resource teacher that oversees the multi-

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		tiered system of support. Mrs. Norman progress monitors our students with IEPs, ensuring the proper systems are in place to support these students, many of which are part of the lowest 25%.
Baker, Alexandra	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Baker is the Staffing Specialist at Rosemont Elementary. She is responsible for maintaining accurate reporting and compliance of our Students with Disabilities. She is the liaison with our parents seeking support for students in our ESE programs. She facilitates meetings with parents and district staff as well as works with teachers to provide best practices and instructional strategies to meet our ESE students' needs. She is a member of the Multi-Tier Systems of Support
Thayer, Megan	Behavior Specialist	Ms. Thayer is the behavior specialist at Rosemont Elementary. She provides teachers and staff strategies on behavior management and de-escalation. Additionally, she oversees Rosemont's school-wide behavioral and student resiliency initiatives and efforts. Ms. Thayer works closely with the school mental health designee to improve student sense of belonging and conflict resolution.

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.

Rosemont began involving stakeholders in the development of the SIP for 23-24 in May 2023, as FAST data became available and we were able to share at the final SAC meeting of the school year. Over the summer, administration met with the leadership team to discuss school-wide data including climate survey results and began identifying areas of success and areas for continued growth in the upcoming school year. During pre-planning Rosemont administration did a data 22-23 data review with all teachers and school staff and received their feedback on glows and grows from the previous year. Finally, our first SAC meeting of the year will occur August 31, 2023, and a portion of the agenda will be designated for discussion around 22-23 data and administration will receive input from the School Advisory Council on our draft SIP.

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))

Teachers will engage in data analysis using the Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 FAST assessments, as well as common assessments to determine how much growth is needed for each student on subsequent administrations. K-2 teachers will establish growth goals within FAST. Student progress toward meeting the established goals will be analyzed after PM2. The MTSS framework will be tightened to ensure accountability for tracking, analyzing, and responding to intervention data. Meetings to discuss student

progress within the tiers will be scheduled at the beginning of the school year to ensure the process is followed with fidelity.

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	97%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: D
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	12	37	16	36	21	18	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	41	31	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	35	31	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	22	33	41	0	0	0	0	112

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	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	14	24	25	33	24	27	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	2	1	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	22	39	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	32	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	1	0	6	17	32	0	0	0	56

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
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	14	24	25	33	24	27	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	2	1	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	22	39	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	32	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	1	0	6	17	32	0	0	0	56

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	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

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*	36	57	53	31	56	56	25		
ELA Learning Gains				57			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			60		
Math Achievement*	37	60	59	46	46	50	31		
Math Learning Gains				72			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			30		
Science Achievement*	41	63	54	33	61	59	25		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	73	59	59	73			34		

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	220
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
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	17	Yes	2	1
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	37	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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	52			

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	36			37			41					73
SWD	22			15							3	
ELL	48			44			64				4	73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			36			39				4	
HSP	59			41			45				3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	36			37			38				4	

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	31	57	47	46	72	68	33					73
SWD	13	40		35	60		18					
ELL	22	55		37	76		21					73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	53	47	41	68	65	32					71
HSP	48	72		59	100		20					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60			90								
FRL	28	57	44	42	70	66	32					76

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	25	38	60	31	27	30	25					34
SWD	4	8		15	18							
ELL	24			35								34
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	36	56	30	25	29	24					36
HSP	19			22								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	24	36	56	29	25	18	24					35

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	47%	54%	-7%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	28%	60%	-32%	58%	-30%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	52%	-19%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	59%	-21%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	62%	-25%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	51%	-12%

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.

According to 22-23 FAST data, ELA achievement showed the lowest performance. Out of the three possible data components, ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 performed the lowest at 39%. The largest contributing factor to low proficiency in reading was the lack of consistent quality Tier 1 instruction. Additionally, the ELA achievement data amongst students that scored at a level 1 or level 2 in PM1 and PM2 shows a need for a more comprehensive reading intervention system that focuses on foundational skills, vocabulary, and prerequisite standards.

To help teachers deliver consistent and quality Tier 1 instruction, there will be an intense focus on the backward design in common planning. Additionally, teachers will receive timely and actionable feedback in the areas of standards-aligned instruction, engagement, monitoring, and questioning.

As it relates to reading intervention, there needs to be a focus on the establishment of a robust reading intervention block that focuses on foundational skills, vocabulary, and prerequisite standards. Through common planning, content area coaches will model engaging and targeted reading intervention lessons. Additionally, teachers will receive professional learning on data-tracking and research-based instructional materials.

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

As a whole, math achievement data showed the greatest decline from the prior year. According to 22-23 mathematics FAST data, there was a 6% decrease in math proficiency from 46% in 21-22 to 40% in 22-23. The largest contributing factor to low proficiency in math was the lack of differentiation of the Math FBS block across all grade levels that existed in the previous year. Additionally our 3-5 teachers did not have a strong foundation in backwards design as part of weekly PLC meetings which was invaluable as they learned new benchmarks that are now a part of the Florida BEST standards.

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 data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average is math proficiency. Rosemont's 3-5 math proficiency is 40%, while the state's math proficiency is 58%. This is an 18-point difference. In 2022, Rosemont's 3-5 math proficiency was 46%, while the state's math proficiency was 57%. This is an 11-point difference. Rosemont's math proficiency is lagging behind the state average.

The largest contributing factor to low proficiency in math was the lack of differentiation of the Math FBS block across all grade levels that existed in the previous year. Additionally, our 3-5 teachers did not have a strong foundation in backward design as part of weekly PLC meetings which was invaluable as they learned new benchmarks that are now a part of the Florida BEST standards. Finally, classroom teachers need additional support in planning, implementing, and receiving feedback on differentiated math small group as part of the core math block.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is the ELA proficiency of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade. This component saw an improvement of 8 points compared to the 21-22 school year. We attribute this improvement in ELA proficiency to the departmentalization of 5th grade as well as a focus on vocabulary acquisition during the writing block.

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

Upon review of EWS data, two potential areas of concern include, students absent 10% or more days as well as the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency.

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

1. Math proficiency
2. ELA proficiency
3. Learning gains of our lowest 25%
4. Science proficiency
5. Reducing the number of retained 3rd grade students by increasing 3rd grade reading proficiency

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 ELA

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.

According to 22-23 ELA FAST data, there was an increase of 8% in student proficiency from 31% in 21-22 to 39%. However, historical data shows that Rosemont has scored below 40% in ELA proficiency each of the last 5 years. This low data component continues to greatly impact the school's grade and must continue being an area of focus.

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

By placing an intense focus on instructional practice related to ELA, Rosemont will grow 6% in the area of ELA proficiency from 39% (PM3 22-23) to 45% (PM3 23-24).

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

The improvement of ELA instructional practice will be monitored through data examination of SBUAs as well as FAST PM1 to PM2. Teachers and resource personnel with engage in continuous data analysis with the overarching goal of improving instructional delivery. Teachers will receive timely and actionable feedback in the areas of standards-aligned instruction, questioning, engagement, monitoring, and student resiliency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cruz Diaz (cruz.diaz@ocps.net)

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.)

In order to continue improving instructional practice related to ELA, teachers and resource personnel will engage in high-level data analysis that focuses on best teaching practices and data-driven instruction. Teachers will be provided timely and actionable feedback for the purpose of improving both core and small group instruction. Additionally, teachers will closely monitor student progress on standards-based unit assessments and Exactpath.

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

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to help teachers make linkages and connections between student data and instructional delivery. Teachers and other resource personnel will monitor student progress on Exactpath/standards-based unit assessments and make instructional decisions to help improve student outcomes.

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.

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

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

By When: Common planning will take place once a week from August 2023-May 2024.

Provide timely and actionable feedback in the areas of standards-aligned instruction, questioning, engagement, monitoring, and student resiliency.

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

By When: Feedback will be provided weekly from August 2023-May 2024.

ELA intervention structures will be monitored for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Sonia Gonzalez (121346@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring of standards-based unit assessments and Exactpath Data

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Our area of math focus will be to increase student proficiency in grades 3-5, as this component saw a 6 point decrease from the previous year, from 46% to 40%. In previous years when Rosemont was able to calculate learning gains, our school celebrated our students' math growth, with 72% of students making a learning gain in 2022. However, learning gains must ultimately lead to increasing student math proficiency.

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

Our goal is to achieve our pre-pandemic math proficiency of 57% on the FAST assessment, which was also the year Rosemont earned a B as a school grade.

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

To monitor the growth in math proficiency, the leadership team and grade-level teams will regularly engage in data analysis of SBUAs and FAST PM1 and PM2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Young (rebecca.young@ocps.net)

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.)

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

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

Backward design will improve the alignment of assessment, curriculum, and instruction to build the capacity of teachers and increase student proficiency. We will use SuccessMaker to monitor students' mastery of grade level benchmarks and monitor the success of the online interventions delivered.

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.

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

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

By When: Common planning will take place once a week from August 2023-May 2024.

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

Person Responsible: Britany Perno (105572@ocps.net)

By When: Common planning will take place once a week from August 2023-May 2024.

Math FBS will be differentiated in grades 3-5 to better meet the needs of all students.

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

By When: September 2023

Based on summative unit assessment data Math FBS focus benchmarks will target spiral standard review and interventions used will be monitored.

Person Responsible: Erica Williams (93789@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Rosemont Elementary will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture for social and emotional learning, we will consequently see an increase in student achievement and student discipline issues will decrease.

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

Based on the Panorama survey data, Rosemont staff responses of the School Climate category was 73%, which increased by 12%. Our goal for the school year is to increase by 10%; from 73% to 83%.

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

Rosemont ES will monitor our staff's school climate through staff surveys quarterly. The administration team will review responses to reflect on current strengths and areas of growth in order to adjust the current climate of the school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheleen Burgess (sheleen.burgess@ocps.net)

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.)

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

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

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student,

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.

Teams will meet to establish norms as a method to communicate when engaged in collaborative discussions. These will be revisited frequently throughout the year to ensure teams communicate and promote a sense of safety and community among staff members.

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

By When: May 2024

The instructional coach will develop an induction program to support new teachers along with a mentor program to develop mentors. The coach will meet regularly with teachers and provide ongoing professional learning along with social emotional activities that promote a sense of belonging at Rosemont ES.

Person Responsible: Britany Perno (105572@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

Rosemont staff will participate in a book study using the book, Now, Discover Your Strengths. This book study will allow staff to utilize their strengths to create a learning environment where students feel empowered and valued.

Person Responsible: Sheleen Burgess (sheleen.burgess@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

Rosemont will establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students. The principal and assistant principals will hold round table discussions periodically with staff and students.

Person Responsible: Megan Thayer (136086@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

The school-wide behavior committee will meet monthly with representatives from each team. The behavior council will discuss behavior issues and trends, by analyzing the most recent behavior data.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Thomas (93622@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

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).

School improvement funding will be discussed by Rosemont's administration and leadership team members noted on the action items associated with the 3 Areas of Focus within the School Improvement Plan at the beginning of the year. A list will be compiled based on need and presented at a School Advisory Council Meeting for discussion and input of the SAC prior to holding an advertised vote to release school improvement funding to the school to support the areas of focus.

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

After reviewing STAR Literacy data from the 2022-2023 school year, it was determined that a critical area for improvement at Rosemont Elementary School is ELA Proficiency. This was chosen as an area of focus based on the low percentage of students achieving proficiency (41%) and the amount of improvement needed in order for most of the students to attain grade level performance.

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

After reviewing 2022-2023 FAST data as well as all available progress monitoring data from the 2022-2023 school year, it was determined that a critical area for improvement at Rosemont Elementary School is ELA Proficiency. This was chosen as an area of focus based on the low percentage of students achieving proficiency (36%) and the amount of improvement needed in order for most of the students to attain grade level performance.

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

- Each grade K -3, using the 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

52% of all students in grades K-2 will demonstrate proficiency as evidenced by the Spring 2024 STAR Literacy administration.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% of all students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency as evidenced by the Spring FAST 2024 administration.

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.

Teachers will engage in data analysis using the Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 FAST assessments, Exact Path assessment results, as well as common assessments to determine how much growth is needed for each student on subsequent administrations. K-2 teachers will establish growth goals within STAR Literacy and Exact Path. Teachers in grades 3-5 will use 22-23 FAST scores as well as analyzing FAST progress monitoring data throughout the 2023-2024 school year. Student progress toward meeting the established goals
will be analyzed after PM2 as well as after each common assessment. The MTSS framework will be tightened to ensure accountability for tracking, analyzing, and responding to intervention data. Meetings to discuss student progress within the tiers will be scheduled at the beginning of the school year to ensure the process is followed with fidelity.

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

Diaz, Cruz, cruz.diaz@ocps.net

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?

To help achieve the K-5 intended outcomes in reading, Rosemont will place an intense focus on small group instruction. Teachers, in collaboration with Corrective Programs and the school-based leadership team
will ensure that small group instruction is deliberate and focused on the following foundational reading skills.
K-3- Phonics, fluency, and vocabulary
4-5- Vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension
Based on the beginning of the year universal screener, teachers in grades K-5 will use the Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) during the reading intervention
block.
Rosemont's school-based administrators will actively monitor teacher implementation of evidence-based strategies. Additionally, timely and actionable feedback will be provided to ensure the effectiveness of implementation (strong, moderate or promising).

Rationale:
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?

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

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers will engage in effective common planning and data analysis in the area of ELA as led by our reading coach and school-based administration to include planning and delivery of effective tier I instruction.	Burgess, Sheleen, sheleen.burgess@ocps.net
Daily classroom walkthroughs will be completed in all grades to ensure the transference from planning to delivery of ELA instruction.	Diaz, Cruz, cruz.diaz@ocps.net
Ongoing daily feedback, coupled with coaching supports, will be provided to all teachers to ensure effective ELA instructional delivery.	Diaz, Cruz, cruz.diaz@ocps.net

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 School Improvement Plan for the 23-24 school year will be shared with Rosemont staff during an upcoming Wednesday after school professional development to frame the reasoning behind the PD focuses throughout the school year. Additionally, the Rosemont SIP will be referenced in weekly PLC meetings with teachers as the focus for our instructional priorities this year as well as progress monitoring updates. Our first SAC meeting of the year will occur August 31, 2023, and a portion of the agenda will be designated for discussion around 22-23 data and administration will receive input from the School Advisory Council on our draft SIP. All subsequent SAC meetings will have a built in part of the agenda related to updates regarding the SIP, including monitoring progress related to the goals as outlined in the SIP. Finally, the SIP will be posted on the Rosemont website, rosemontes.ocps.net

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))

Rosemont plans to capitalize on the growth we saw last year in the area of parent engagement by hosting academic parent nights, as well as 3 conference weeks following the end of the first 3 quarters of school. Our Parent Engagement Liaison will also continue to serve as a point of contact for our families to ensure our students' needs are being met and parents, especially those of the lowest 25% are increasing their involvement at Rosemont. Additionally, Rosemont will begin using TalkingPoints as a communication tool between teachers and parents, as well as administration and parents. Talking Points is also capable of translating into all the languages we serve at Rosemont. Rosemont's Family Engagement Plan can be found at rosemontes.ocps.net.

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))

Rosemont is committed to continuous improvement of our academic program. We are using previous years' data to make informed decisions as it relates to instruction. Our teachers are involved in twice weekly PLCs with content area coaches and administration to ensure the planning and preparing of lessons is done with backward design at the forefront. Our school is committed to an MTSS structure that identifies and intervenes with all students needing Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports. Finally, our small group and FBS structures in both reading and math, ensure differentiated instruction occurs in every classroom, meaning that those in need of both intervention and enrichment are provided such in the classroom.

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 SIP has elicited feedback from a variety of stakeholders that serve the Rosemont community.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Rosemont uses Tier 1 classroom support to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. Students participate in daily morning meetings using the Caring Schools Community Curriculum and weekly Caring Schools Community lessons. Additionally, teachers are able to refer students to our school counselor, behavior specialist, and school social worker for additional specialized support services. Rosemont also ensures the school's STAT meets monthly and during and occurrence of an on-campus threat made by a student. Through the threat assessment process, we help families access additional resources, often through outside referrals to assist.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Rosemont assists families in identifying available magnet programs offered in OCPS.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Rosemont teachers and staff received a PD during pre-planning that addressed Classroom management and classroom behavior. Teachers learned strategies to prevent problem behaviors. The code of student conduct was also reviewed with teachers and they all received a discipline flow chart to assist in decision making. If teachers need additional support our Dean and Behavior Specialist work together to devise a classroom behavior plan as part of MTSS in order to track the data related to behavior interventions. Our ESE students that are in need of behavior support also are part of MTSS and are further referred to the staffing specialist if a BIP needs to be created.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Throughout the year, Rosemont will be offering monthly PDs based on our 4 big rocks- benchmark alignment, engagement, monitoring, and Rosemont resiliency. During twice weekly PLCs teachers will participate in data dives and address areas of strength and areas of opportunity and plans for reteach and reassessment.

Rosemont will recruit and retain effective teachers by creating a supportive environment for educators built around high expectations and feedback that ensures continuous growth. Administration will highlight and celebrate staff throughout the year using a variety of methods, such as staff member of the week, monthly breakfasts, family field days, etc.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our school offers full-time VPK and we find that those students that participate in our VPK program prior to Kindergarten are better prepared to be successful Kindergartners. Our VPK teacher works closely with the Kindergarten team to ensure the VPK program is best suited to prepare our future Kindergarten students. Our Parent Engagement Liaison meets with our new Kindergarten families as an orientation to Kindergarten to best prepare them for the change from preschool to Kindergarten. Additionally, our interventionist team and student services team is heavily involved in the days of our Kindergarten students, especially during the first few days of school, especially to support those that are newcomers to school.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes