

Polk County Public Schools

Rochelle School Of The Arts School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/rochellearts>

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.

Rochelle School of the Arts is committed to using best practices to provide an enriched, rigorous and relevant curriculum through the arts and academics in a challenging environment. Rochelle School of the Arts is committed to doing "Whatever It Takes" to provide an enriched and rigorous curriculum through the arts and academics in a challenging environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Rochelle School of the Arts will ignite all students for the future by providing a rigorous academic curriculum along with the active study of the visual and performing arts.

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
Griffin, Carol	Principal	Mrs. Griffin serves the students and staff of Rochelle School of the Arts as an instructional leader by setting clear expectations and setting high goals for academic achievement. She meets weekly with teachers to review lesson plans, discuss initiatives being introduced by the school district, and solicit teacher input on ways the leadership team can assist in classrooms. Mrs. Griffin leads professional learning communities to build teacher pedagogy. She works closely with academic instructional coaches to develop schedules to assist teachers and provide support in every classroom.
Bryant, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Bryant serves as an instructional leader in elementary standard and assessment curriculums. She meets with teachers to review data from unit and weekly reading tests, math modules, and discusses how instruction will be modified from whole group to small group to meet the needs of all students. Mrs. Bryant provides information on school-wide discipline data, ensures that school-based team participates in implementation of intervention support and documentation, & ensures adequate professional development to support/increase knowledge and skills of staff.
Gregory, Katelyn	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Gregory serves as an instructional leader in middle school standard assessment curriculums. She meets with teachers to review data and discusses how instruction will be modified to meet the needs of all students. Mrs. Gregory provides information on school-wide discipline data, ensures that school-based team participates in implementation of intervention support and documentation, & ensures adequate professional development to support/increase knowledge and skills of staff.
Horvatin, Jen	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Horvatin is the Mathematics Instructional Coach who works closely with teachers on collaborative planning each week. Collaborative planning sessions focus on how teachers will meet the depth of the benchmark, and how teachers will modify lessons to reach all student ability levels based on the data collected. She supports instructional delivery by working with teachers in the classroom to model best practices, co-teach whole group lessons, and facilitate small group or one to one instruction. Mrs. Horvatin meets weekly with administration to discuss concerns, share good news, and develop plans to assist instructional staff members.
Mayes, Kim	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Mayes is the Reading Instructional Coach who works closely with teachers on collaborative planning each week. Collaborative planning sessions focus on how teachers will meet the depth of the benchmark, and how teachers will modify lessons to reach all student ability levels based on the data collected. She supports instructional delivery by working with teachers in the classroom to model best practices, co-teach whole group lessons, and facilitate small group or one to one instruction. Mrs. Mayes meets weekly with administration to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		discuss concerns, share good news, and develop plans to assist instructional staff members.
Chehaib, Hiba	School Counselor	Hiba Chehaib is the Elementary School Counselor. She provides quality services and knowledge on issues ranging from program design to assessment and progress monitoring with individual students. She communicates with child serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral and social success. Mrs. Chehaib works with our school's outreach team and supports the efforts of the members of the team.
Willoughby, Denise	School Counselor	Denise Willoughby is the school's Middle School Counselor. She provides quality services and knowledge on issues ranging from program design to assessment and progress monitoring with individual students. She communicates with child serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral and social success. Mrs. Willoughby works with our school's outreach team and supports the efforts of the members of the team.
gregory, lisa	Other	Lisa Gregory - Testing Coordinator - Mrs. Gregory leads all school, district and state assessment processes. She also assists teachers with analyzing data to maximize student success.
bonney, derrien	Dean	Provides articulation between the Office of Discipline and school administration related to discipline. Interprets and applies School Board Code of Conduct and discipline policies related to student discipline within the school site. Remains current on the latest pedagogical studies relating to MTSS, PBIS, discipline, restorative justice, and alternative education. Works with administrators and school personnel in solving school-wide problems related to the Code of Student Conduct.

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.

The School Improvement Plan is review annually through multiple stakeholders. The Leadership team consisting of; Mrs. Griffin, Mrs. Bryant, Mrs. Gregory, Mr. Bonney, Mrs. Horvatin, Mrs. Mayes, Mrs. Willoughby, and Mrs. Chebaib, meets over the summer to review and discuss the School Improvement Plan and goals for the next school year. The Title 1 Coordinator, Mrs. Mayes, reviews the SIP annually with elementary parents and with middle school parents during the Title 1 stakeholder events. All parents and guardians are invited to attend through a flyer sent home, school messenger, and social media.

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 regularly monitored for effective implementation weekly through the leadership team meeting. During this meeting the leadership team will meet to discuss the students involved in interventions and needs of teachers, specifically in the Sciences and ELA classrooms to address the SIP goals. The team will also discuss students in the ESSA subgroup of SWD to monitor interventions and accommodations provided. Involved in the Leadership team is Mrs. Griffin, Mrs. Bryant, Mrs. Gregory, Mr. Bonney, Mrs. Horvatin, Mrs. Mayes, Mrs. Willoughby, and Mrs. Chebaib. SIP Goals will also be monitored through district quarterly assessment data, F.A.S.T PMI data, and PM2 data.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	11	17	17	9	19	15	6	19	10	123	
One or more suspensions	5	4	6	6	19	14	7	21	23	105	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	5	2	8	12	3	0	18	16	1	65	
Course failure in Math	1	2	4	3	12	8	0	9	5	44	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	19	18	14	15	18	100	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	36	39	19	11	10	127	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	20	8	9	22	22	5	8	8	110	

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	2	7	7	15	29	30	12	20	18	140	

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	1	0	0	3	4	0	2	2	0	12
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	0	13	18	18	11	18	23	6	13	120	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	3	11	8	17	16	59	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	5	0	0	1	13	4	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	3	13	22	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	14	16	57	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	31	28	95	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	28	36	18	9	7	4	0	0	102	

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	3	5	1	5	30	38	34	38	154	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	0	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	0	13	18	18	11	18	23	6	13	120
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	3	11	8	17	16	59
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	5	0	0	1	13	4	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	3	13	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	14	16	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	31	28	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	28	36	18	9	7	4	0	0	102

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	3	5	1	5	30	38	34	38	154

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	0	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*	56	48	53	58	51	55	57		
ELA Learning Gains				49			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			43		
Math Achievement*	53	49	55	58	37	42	53		
Math Learning Gains				54			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			45		
Science Achievement*	39	47	52	51	48	54	36		
Social Studies Achievement*	85	68	68	90	53	59	80		
Middle School Acceleration	76	61	70	80	43	51	85		
Graduation Rate		54	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	67	50	55		55	70			

** 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
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	13	Yes	4	3
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	61			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	55			

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	28	Yes	3	2
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	61			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	54			

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	56			53			39	85	76			67
SWD	16			16			7				3	
ELL	48			52							3	67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			38			19	76	78		6	
HSP	54			53			37	88	63		7	73
MUL	56			44							2	
PAC												
WHT	72			70			63	97	82		6	
FRL	48			43			30	82	74		7	60

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	58	49	40	58	54	47	51	90	80			
SWD	27	34	27	20	34	35	18					
ELL	55	55	50	61	52		50					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	38	38	46	48	55	29	84	86			
HSP	62	59	42	60	59	33	57	92	88			
MUL	53	53		63	64							
PAC												
WHT	74	55	44	69	57	41	71	93	79			
FRL	48	46	44	48	51	46	40	88	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	57	56	43	53	51	45	36	80	85			
SWD	18	39	38	13	39	37						
ELL	35	38		35	50							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	50	43	39	40	34	25	72	80			
HSP	57	57		54	57	57	45	82	85			
MUL	79	67		42	47							
PAC												
WHT	71	64	46	72	61	61	49	90	87			
FRL	43	47	36	40	38	35	22	66	84			

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	53%	43%	10%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	36%	19%	47%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	39%	19%	47%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	53%	-9%	58%	-14%
06	2023 - Spring	63%	35%	28%	47%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	42%	15%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	38%	15%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	45%	35%	10%	48%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	51%	17%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	56%	-12%	61%	-17%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	42%	24%	55%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	33%	13%	44%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	39%	-8%	51%	-20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	37%	46%	50%	33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	37%	63%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	65%	20%	66%	19%

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.

Based on statewide assessments in Spring 2023, fifth grade science showed the lowest performance with 31% proficient on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment. For the Spring 2022 data, proficiency for this group had previously been at 43%, with a 12% decrease. The district quarterlies showed 52% proficient for quarter 1, 53% proficient for quarter 2, and 46% proficient for quarter 3.

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

Based on statewide assessments in Spring 2023, fifth grade science showed the greatest decline with 31% proficient on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment. For the Spring 2022 data, proficiency for this group had previously been at 43%, with a 12% decrease. The district quarterlies showed 52% proficient for quarter 1, 53% proficient for quarter 2, and 46% proficient for quarter 3.

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.

Based on statewide assessments in Spring 2023, 4th grade math showed the greatest gap when compared to the district and state average. We had 44% of students proficient, while the district had 56% of student proficient, leaving a 12% gap. PM1 showed a 14% proficient, PM2 showed a 23% proficient, and PM3 showed a 44% proficient. This shows a significant increase from PM2 to PM3. Factors that contributed to this gap were staff turnover and vacancies.

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

Based on statewide assessments in Spring 2023, 3rd grade English Language Arts showed the most improvement when compared to the district and state average. We had 58% of students proficient, while the district had 42% of student proficient. Student preformed at 35% proficient for PM1, 39% proficient for PM2, and 58% for PM3. For the Spring 2022 data, proficiency for this group had previously been at 44%, with a 13% increase. Actions that occurred where support staff and the instructional coach identifying students and assisting with instruction in small groups and inside the classroom.

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

Based on statewide assessments in Spring 2023, fifth grade science showed the lowest performance with 31% proficient on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment. We identify the SWD from this group and identified an area of concern. There were six students identified as SWD in the fifth-grade science

data group. These students all received level one on the assessment ranging from 3% proficient to 43% proficient.

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

- 1.) Fifth and Eighth Grade Science Proficiency
- 2.) SWD ESSA Subgroup
- 3.) Fourth and Seventh Grade English Language Arts 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 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.

All students will receive standards-aligned instruction to improve and maintain student achievement in science. Intentional planning, implementing, and monitoring of students will impact student learning and assist them in maintaining high levels of proficiency. For the Spring of 2023 state assessment, 31% of students were proficient in 5th grade science. This was a 12% decrease from the prior year and below the district average of 39% proficient. For the Spring of 2023 state assessment, 46% of students were proficient in 3rd grade science. This was a 10% decrease from the prior year and below the district average of 33% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For 5th grade science the proficiency level will increase from 31% to 36%. For 5th grade science the proficiency level will increase from 46% to 51%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will collaborate in Professional Learning Community meetings weekly to ensure that the instructional tasks students complete are aligned to the new BEST standards and the level of complexity required to fully address the benchmark. Teachers will collaborate in Professional Learning Community meetings weekly to ensure that the ARC process is being used and implemented. Students will be monitored through district progress monitoring and State Assessments. Bi-weekly science planning meetings with district support Amy Steele, monthly common assessment results, quarterly assessment data, and students grades on interims and report cards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.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.)

Explicit instruction will be provided in math classrooms, giving students the opportunity for guided and independent practice. This instruction will improve students ability to perform operations and solve word problems. In addition, building fact fluency in all grade levels will be used to improve students progression towards the benchmark.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need modeling and repeated practice of new skills as well as reviewing skills they have learned in the past.

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.

ARC planning and implementation will be monitored weekly for standard aligned instruction and assessments. Weekly PLC's with the implementation of the BEST Benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Kim Mayes (kimberlee.mayes@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

The data will continue to be monitored through quarterly data chats, progress monitoring tools, student grades, student assessments, and Performance Matters reports pulled to identify students' progress with district assessments.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.net)

By When: Quarterly

K-8 Curriculum Planning for teachers to develop standards-based lessons.

Scaffolding the lessons during core instruction will assist in ensuring that all students are able to grasp concepts.

Person Responsible: Katelyn Gregory (katelyn.gregory@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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 the weekly retention report Rochelle will focus on teacher recruitment and retention for the 2023 - 2024 school year. There was a total of 12 positions that needed to be filled from the previous school year. These positions included one administrator position, one dean position, seven instructional positions, and three para-professional positions. Reasons for these vacancies included retirement, transfers, and exiting of the teaching profession.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Rochelle School of the Arts will retain 90% of its staff for the following school year. This does not include retirements from Polk County Schools.

Monitoring:

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

Hiring, certification, and professional development will be monitored before and during the school year for newly hired individuals. Using SAP, FLDOE Certification, and district support new staff to Rochelle will be monitored to maintain certification and training as needed for retention. This will be monitored by the weekly vacancy report, sign-in from professional development and teacher trainings, weekly PLC sign ins, and staff climate surveys each semester.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carol Griffin (carol.griffin@polk-fl.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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The report summarizes recent state investments in addressing teacher shortages and examines potential policy solutions to mitigate ongoing shortages. Berry, B., Bastian, K. C., Darling-Hammond, L., & Kini, T. (2021). The importance of teaching and learning conditions: Influences on teacher retention and school performance.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

TIPS District Training and Campus Induction. This allows for new staff to become confident and introduced to the strategies, supports, and interventions implemented in Polk County. This allows for the staff to create a relationship and welcoming environment with the staff and school prior to the start of the

school year. The school also has a new teacher mentor program where new teachers are partnered with veteran teachers for support and coaching.

Person Responsible: Kim Mayes (kimberlee.mayes@polk-fl.net)

By When: Summer prior to school starting.

Teachers will collaborate in Professional Learning Community meetings weekly to ensure that the instructional tasks students complete are aligned to the new BEST standards and the level of complexity required to fully address the benchmark. Teachers will collaborate in Professional Learning Community meetings weekly to ensure that the ARC process is being used and implemented. Students will be monitored through district progress monitoring and State Assessments.

Person Responsible: Jen Horvatin (jennifer.horvatin@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will participate in administrative walkthroughs and observations using Journey to ensure that the instructional tasks students complete are aligned to the new BEST standards and the level of complexity required to fully address the benchmark. Teachers will complete a self-evaluation, SAO, informal observations, and formal observation for feedback and growth.

Person Responsible: Katelyn Gregory (katelyn.gregory@polk-fl.net)

By When: Quarterly.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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 the results from the 2022 - 2023 FAST Assessment, the following subgroup performed below 41% overall proficiency. The subgroup was: Students with Disabilities - 27%

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of appropriate implementation of MTSS, our Students with Disabilities will perform at a minimum of 41% proficiency overall. Student learning will be monitored through grade level summative assessments, formative assessments, district progress monitoring tools, and the new FAST progress monitoring assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Regular data chats with teachers and coaches on the progress of the ESSA subgroup. Evaluation of MTSS documentation. SST meetings for those students going through the MTSS process. Nonevaluative classroom walkthroughs by administration. SWD IDEAS training on 8/22 and again for the second quarter. SWD students that recieved a 1 or 2 on math or reading assessments will be pulled weekly and monitored for intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hiba Chehaib (hiba.chehaib@polk-fl.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.)

Teachers will be meeting with Tier II and Tier III students daily via small groups during core instruction and power hour to provide targeted intervention. Classroom teachers will conduct weekly assessments in both ELA and Math of students that are in the ESSA subgroup. Teachers will monitor the progress of those students via data chats and meet in collaborative groups to discuss grade level progress. Grade levels will conduct bimonthly data meetings with both administration and academic coaches. Inclusion teachers will attend PLCs to facilitate an increase in the SWD ESSA subgroup. Teachers will communicate with parents through a variety of means (phone calls, email, agenda) with documentation. Administration will be monitoring parent communication every nine weeks through teacher communication logs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the previous data, there was (1) ESSA subgroup that did not meet the 41% Federal Index.

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.

K-8 Curriculum Planning for teachers to develop standards-based lessons.

Scaffolding the lessons during core instruction will assist in ensuring that all students are able to grasp concepts.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Paras will work with small groups of students to assist in filling in learning gaps and reteaching when applicable based on learning gaps identified by data and the classroom teacher observations. Small groups of students work with the paras under the direct supervision of the classroom teacher. Media books to build content knowledge to support comprehension, and impact independent reading as measured by Accelerated Reader.

Person Responsible: Kim Mayes (kimberlee.mayes@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly for Elementary

Paras will work with small groups of students to assist in filling in learning gaps and reteaching when applicable based on learning gaps identified by data and the classroom teacher observations. Small groups of students work with the paras under the direct supervision of the classroom teacher. Media books to build content knowledge to support comprehension, and impact independent reading as measured by Accelerated Reader.

Person Responsible: Jen Horvatin (jennifer.horvatin@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly for Middle School

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 allocations are review through the schools Student Advisory Committee Meetings, Staff Professional Development and Staff Surveys, Family and Community Title One Surveys and Title One Family and guardians' events and presentations.

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

Core instruction in grades K-2 must be strengthened in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness, sentence and paragraph comprehension.

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

In grades 3-5 core instruction must be strengthened in comprehension, fluency and integration of knowledge and ideas.

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

Each grade K-2, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system will achieve a 50 percent rate to be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Each grade 3-5, using progress monitoring systems will achieve a 50 percent pass rate or higher with the statewide ELA assessment. The 3rd grade ELA assessment had a 57% proficiency for the 22-23 school year. The goal is to increase to 60% proficiency for the 23-24 school year. The 4th grade ELA assessment had a 44% proficiency for the 22-23 school year. The goal is to increase to 50% proficiency for the 23-24 school year. The 5th grade ELA assessment had a 53% proficiency for the 22-23 school year. The goal is to increase to 58% proficiency for the 23-24 school year.

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.

Each grade level will be monitored through weekly collaborative planning that uses the ARC process for formative and summative assessment planning in ELA. These step 6 and step 7 assessments will be used to guide the instruction and for student data. Weekly student grades in ELA will be monitored by the teachers and guidance. STAR assessments will be given each semester and used for student data and to drive instruction. Best and district writing assessments will be given each semester and used for student data and to drive instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mayes, Kim, kimberlee.mayes@polk-fl.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?

School level leadership team supports ELA teachers through professional learning communities, collaborative planning, and classroom standard based walks. The School Improvement plan also supports the ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities, many also fall in the level 1 or level 2 for ELA proficiency. Mrs. Mayes the literacy coach supports teachers in ELA through weekly ARC planning and implementation and ongoing support. During these weekly planning sessions differentiated lessons are created using data from student's formative and summative assessments.

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?

Lack of student proficiency across subgroups and core content. Classroom management needs to be consistent across the campus to keep expectations high for all and not have behavior be a barrier to academic success. Educators would incorporate the consistent use of high effect strategies in their classrooms.

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 Leadership:

Literacy Coaching:

- Weekly push in support from literacy coach.
- Weekly collaboration and planning meetings with grade levels and coach.
- Teach coaching and mentoring as identified by administration for teacher needs.

Assessment:

- Week planning and implementation of ARC formative, summative, and game day experience assessments.
- STAR assessments provided quarterly.
- District writing assessments provided three times in the school year. Use of rubric and teacher feedback on performance matters.

Griffin, Carol,
carol.griffin@polk-fl.net

Professional Learning:

- Weekly Professional Learning Communities for each grade level. ARC planning and implementation in ELA and mathematics.

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.

- School/District Webpage
- PEN Notebook
- Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings
- Annual Meeting

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))

- Building Capacity Events
- Staff Capacity Building Professional Development
 - o Conferencing
 - o Family/school relationship
- Family/Community Input
- Data Chats/Conferences
- Webpage
- Annual Meeting
- Preventing Barriers

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))

- Supplemental Staff (academic coaches, interventionists, paraprofessionals)
- Supplemental Resources
- Extended Learning
- Professional Development
- Collaborative Planning

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))

- Data Com
- School Improvement Planning Trainings
- Regional Meetings
- Summer Leadership Academy
- Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Mtg
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance
- ESE, Migrant, Early Childhood

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))

- <https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/>
- Individual Counseling
- Group Counseling
- School Consultations
- Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center
- Support Groups

- o Grief Support
- o Children's Home Society

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))

- Dual Enrollment
- IB/Cambridge
- Career Academies
- Vocational Schools
- Building Capacity of Events – Transition events

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).

- PBiS
- RTI
- MTSS
- Behavior Interventionist, Student Success Coaches, Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors, Deans

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))

- Professional Learning Communities to improve instruction and data
- Response to Data
- Collective Bargaining Stipends – Title I, Critical Shortage Area, Highly Effective
- Recruitment and Educator Quality Department - PCPS Culture Ambassador Program

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))

- Early Childhood - <https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/>
- Head Start
- VPK (Title I, ESE and non-Title I)
- Kindergarten Round Up
- Kindergarten Readiness Camps
- Books Bridge Bus
- Migrant Early Childhood Services

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: Science	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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.

No