Rosewood Magnet School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rosewood Magnet School

3850 16TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32960

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Casandra Flores

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: A 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The Mission of Rosewood Magnet, a Core Knowledge School, is to inspire a love of literacy and learning through engaging instruction, collaboration, and critical thinking with the support of dedicated teachers, staff, parents and community leading to academic excellence and globally minded students that will become responsible, productive citizens and leaders of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision statement of Rosewood Magnet School is A...Rich Tradition and...Bright Future.. It is a succinct statement that embraces the mission of our school to educate every student where academic excellence leads to responsible, productive citizens. Our vision statement is mounted on the entrance to our school to remind us that academic excellence for our students is a result of eager to learn students, a challenging educational curriculum, dedicated teachers and staff, involved parents and community support. It embraces all we do. Believing and achieving excellence is the foundation of what our school is built upon. Through our "rich tradition" of excellence, we make a difference in each student's life and "brighten their futures" for a better tomorrow.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Flores, Casandra	Principal	Principal - serves as instructional leader; oversees the completion of the CIMS plan, keeps staff, parents and community informed of progress in academic progress and how initiatives relate to SIP, keep the focus on students' academic progress, monitors academic and behavior data and subgroup data within this data, and works closely with the School Advisory Council on school improvement issues
Norris, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal-Facilitator of MTSS, volunteer coordinator, MTSS paperwork compliance, initial Gifted screenings, begins MTSS referral process with teachers, data gatherer and collaborates with our leadership team and teachers in the completion of the CIMS plan, assessment coordinator
Ross, Lisa	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach- facilitates reading interventions & Professional development; oversees Reading, Language Arts and Writing goals for the CIMS plan, active member of the PST/MTSS team, monitors student academic data, and monitors fidelity of RTI interventions
Nesper, Megan	Instructional Coach	
Johnston, Tabitha	Administrative Support	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	94	92	90	92	91	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	4	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	9	14	6	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	58%	57%	66%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	54%	53%	40%	49%	48%
Math Achievement	77%	63%	63%	73%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	70%	60%	62%	72%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	48%	51%	53%	52%	47%
Science Achievement	76%	54%	53%	64%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	94 (0)	92 (0)	90 (0)	92 (0)	91 (0)	88 (0)	547 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	1 ()	4 ()	1 ()	2 ()	5 ()	13 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	9 (0)	14 (0)	6 (0)	9 (0)	11 (0)	49 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	79%	60%	19%	58%	21%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison	17%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
	2018	69%	56%	13%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	9%					
05	2019	75%	54%	21%	56%	19%
	2018	66%	52%	14%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison	9%					
Cohort Comparison	6%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	64%	8%	62%	10%
	2018	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	64%	16%	64%	16%
	2018	80%	63%	17%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	53%	23%	53%	23%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	40	60	59	52	63	55	42				
BLK	71	68		58	74		55				
HSP	76	64		81	79						
MUL	86			64							
WHT	75	64	56	81	66	55	80				
FRL	63	59	52	62	65	45	63				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	35	39	30	37	45	43	50				
BLK	64	63		61	58		43				
HSP	71	69		76	88		50				
MUL	75			83							
WHT	65	53	35	74	73	61	68				
FRL	55	51	42	60	63	52	56				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	65
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	75
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Math learning gains showed the lowest performance. Although proficiency was high the gains dropped in this area. We believe small group, specific and differentiated instruction was limited and led to lower gains.

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

Math learning gains showed the lowest performance. Although proficiency was high the gains dropped in this area. We saw that several of our on and above level students did

not make enough of a point increase to show a learning gain, we also saw that our bottom quartile in math struggled to show growth. We believe this is due to less differentiation and small group instruction happening in math so we will make this a focus area for the year.

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

The greatest gap in performance for our school was a positive gap in the area of science. All areas, ELA, Math and Science scored above the state average. The area with the least gap, showing an area for more focus was again our math bottom quartile learning gains. We will focus on small group instruction, reteaching of needed standards and differentiation of math instruction.

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

Our science showed the greatest growth. We saw significant growth in this area. Our teachers utilized a lot of hands on practice with the science standards and content. They utilized the new Discovery Education curriculum and supported with technology and student research projects. They also focused on content vocabulary. A dedicated amount of time was spend on the nature of science at the beginning of the year and throughout the year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Focus areas will be the number of students in grades 2-4 last year, this year's 3-5 students who scored a level one on their state assessment. We will work to move them towards proficiency.

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

1. Bottom Quartile Learning gains in Math.
2. Bottom Quartile Learning gains in ELA.
3. Learning gains in ELA (higher level need to continue to show growth.)
4. Learning gains in Math (higher level need to continue to show growth.)
5. Student attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase learning gains in our bottom quartile in Math and ELA.
Rationale	If teachers provide differentiated, small group instruction to reteach and reinforce skills, while encouraging higher order thinking strategies, then we will see an increase in learning gains in our bottom quartile for both math and ELA.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through focused small group instruction and implementing higher order thinking strategies we will see an increase in learning gains of our bottom quartile to 62% in ELA and 60% in math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use of differentiated small group instruction and implementation of Thinking Maps across all content areas and grade levels to encourage higher order thinking skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have found research (Marzano, Hattie) that shows student's use of higher order thinking strategies such as graphic organizers to work through their thinking increases their ability to retain information and independently work through problem solving. We will implement Thinking Maps a focused set of graphic organizer to build a common language and consistent set of tools to be used school wide.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide professional development to all teachers on Thinking Maps in partnership with FDLRS. 2. Provide a schedule and structure for teachers to begin implementing thinking maps with whole group instruction. 3. Provide guidance and expectations for small group instruction. Have an identified time for each class for small group instruction in both math and ELA. 4. Provide ongoing support on the implementation of use of thinking maps with students on a weekly basis for the first nine weeks along with FDLRS team. 5. Monitor small group instruction for differentiation of instruction and use of thinking maps to encourage higher order thinking. Provide regular feedback to teachers on implementation and impact based on student data.
Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

#2	
Title	Increase learning gains for on level and above level students.
Rationale	If teachers provide differentiated, small group instruction to reteach and reinforce skills, while encouraging higher order thinking strategies, then we will see an increase in learning gains in our on level and above level students for both math and ELA.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through focused small group instruction and implementing higher order thinking strategies we will see an increase in learning gains of our on level and above level students to 68% in ELA and 73% in math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use of differentiated small group instruction, which could include independent enrichment challenges, and implementation of Thinking Maps across all content areas and grade levels to encourage higher order thinking skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have found research (Marzano, Hattie) that shows student's use of higher order thinking strategies such as graphic organizers to work through their thinking increases their ability to retain information and independently work through problem solving. We will implement Thinking Maps a focused set of graphic organizer to build a common language and consistent set of tools to be used school wide.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide professional development to all teachers on Thinking Maps in partnership with FDLRS. 2. Provide a schedule and structure for teachers to begin implementing thinking maps with whole group instruction. 3. Provide guidance and expectations for small group instruction. Have an identified time for each class for small group instruction in both math and ELA. 4. Provide ongoing support on the implementation of use of thinking maps with students on a weekly basis for the first nine weeks along with FDLRS team. 5. Monitor small group instruction for differentiation of instruction and use of thinking maps to encourage higher order thinking. Provide regular feedback to teachers on implementation and impact based on student data.
Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

#3	
Title	Improve/maintain attendance at a 95% average school wide.
Rationale	If our students are present in school and arriving on time, they are not missing instruction, this will lead to increases in learning gains.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will maintain and/or improve attendance rates through monthly monitoring of students attendance by our attendance committee, as well as parent involvement when attendance becomes a concern for a student, this will increase attendance rates to an average of 95% or higher school wide.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Norris (jennifer.norris@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use monthly progress monitoring meetings to track student attendance and involve the parents and students in progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows that by involving families and students in tracking their own progress and making them aware of the impact attendance has on learning it can positively lead to increased attendance, which in turn leads to greater learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	1. Attendance committee will meet monthly to evaluate school attendance and any students with less than 90% attendance in that period. 2. Attendance committee will notify parents of students with less than 90% attendance and begin communication to alert them of the concern. 3. If attendance does not improve family will be invited to attend a meeting to discuss attendance and identify strategies to help support them in improving attendance. 4. Attendance committee will continue to monitor student attendance and meet with the family until attendance approves. The school district social worker will be notified and invited to attend monthly meetings and work with families to find strategies for improving attendance. 5.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Norris (jennifer.norris@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

N/A

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	**Areas of Focus: Increase learning gains in our bottom quartile in Math and ELA.**				**$6,647.50**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0041 - Rosewood Magnet School	Other		$3,047.50

	5100	750-Other Personal Services	0041 - Rosewood Magnet School	Other		$3,500.00

Notes: Thinking Maps Training and Thinking Maps Binders Split the cost with FDLRS - We purchased 23 binders for $3,047.50 FDLRS purchased 22 binders for 2,915.00 FDLRS is providing the training support.

Notes: Teachers will participate in collaborative planning sessions to breakdown the standards to the depths of the content limits and determine how to incorporate small group instruction and the use of higher order thinking skills, Thinking Maps, into their instruction.

	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0041 - Rosewood Magnet School	Other		$100.00

Notes: Standards/Test spec books as needed for replacements and new teachers.

2	III.A	**Areas of Focus: Increase learning gains for on level and above level students.**	**$0.00**
3	III.A	**Areas of Focus: Improve/maintain attendance at a 95% average school wide.**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$6,647.50**