Rosewood Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rosewood Magnet School

3850 16TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32960

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Adam FAU St

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.](http://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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
Johnston, Tabitha	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Adam FAU St

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A

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

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	81	91	93	91	92	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/8/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

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%	72%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	68%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	54%	53%	54%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	63%	63%	75%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	60%	62%	78%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	48%	51%	62%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	54%	53%	69%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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				

2017 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	34	52	41	33	64	61	30				
BLK	58	60	40	61	85						
HSP	74	57		93	77		64				
WHT	74	72	58	74	78	52	74				
FRL	57	61	48	68	75	64	50				

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.

Our bottom quartile learning gains in our SWD subgroup in both ELA (59%) and Math (55%), and proficiency in our AA subgroup in math (58% compared to 81% WHT subgroup) and SWD subgroup (52%) were our areas of lowest performance.
Students struggled with multi-step problem solving and having the stamina and perseverance to complete problems. Missed instruction during pull out services and less exposure to (and time to complete and interact with) grade level instruction impacted performance of our SWD subgroup.

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

We saw the greatest decline in our math learning gains across grade levels. Missed instruction during pull out services. Less exposure and expectation to complete grade level work/tasks. Designated time for math intervention and fidelity in providing math intervention. Lack of math intervention resources.

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.

Our math bottom quartile was 6% above the state average and our ELA bottom quartile was 7% above the state average. These are the areas where we saw a smaller positive gap between our scores and state scores.

We saw the greatest decline in our math learning gains across grade levels. Missed instruction during pull out services. Less exposure and expectation to complete grade level work/tasks. Designated time for math intervention and fidelity in providing math intervention. Lack of math intervention resources.

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

Our science data showed significant growth going from 64% to 76%. ELA went from 66% to 75%. These were both areas of great growth. We believe this went hand in hand with an emphasis being made on reading. All reading, everywhere, across contents and all reading types. We also saw an increase in informational reading. We had a new curriculum in science as well and grade levels focused on academic vocabulary.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two areas of concern are students with a level 1 on state wide assessments and student attendance.

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

1. Students with disabilities proficiency in both ELA and Math.
2. Proficiency in math for our AA subgroup.
3. ELA learning gains.
4. Math learning gains.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the area of math we will focus on improving math proficiency in our African American subgroup and students with disabilities subgroup. We will focus on interventions that are explicit and systematic, teaching students strategies for solving multi-step word problems and their common underlying structures. We will also adjust our practices in providing ESE services to students by utilizing push in services where students remain in the general education classroom increasing exposure and time to interact with grade level content.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to increase the proficiency of our AA subgroup by 7% and SWD subgroup by 10% based on state assessments. We will do this be consistently providing tier 2 and 3 math interventions with fidelity 3-5 days a week. We will see a decrease in the amount of instructional minutes missed due to pull out services.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will consistently provide Tier 2 interventions with fidelity. Focusing on the use of Khan Academy, Reflex Math, Go Math and iReady Toolbox.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that Tier 2 interventions have a 1.29 high effect size based on Hattie's Research in his book "Visible Learning for Teachers". The identified strategies are recommended by the Florida Department of Education evidence-based strategies list.

Action Steps to Implement	

Provide a schedule and structure for teachers to begin implementing Tier 2 math interventions and small group instruction within the first 4 weeks of school.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Provide professional development to all teachers on Tier 2 interventions within the first nine weeks and throughout the year as needed.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Instructional monitoring feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational walk through data, every 6 weeks.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Share disparities in academic recognition and academic grades amongst subgroups with teachers every nine weeks.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Continued and enhanced academic achievement analysis of each subgroup to determine needs, each quarter.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Provide additional professional development and feedback cycles as needed each nine weeks.

Person Responsible Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the area of ELA we will focus on improving reading proficiency in our students with disabilities and African American subgroups. We will focus on teaching students strategies for determining unknown vocabulary, using inferencing and utilizing higher order reasoning skills to determine answers that are not directly identified/stated in the text. We will also adjust our practices in providing ESE services to students by utilizing push in services where students remain in the general education classroom increasing exposure and time to interact with grade level content.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase the proficiency of our AA subgroup by 7% and SWD subgroup by 10% based on state assessments. We will see an increase in the use of thinking maps, to be used weekly, for organizing thinking and summarizing learning. We will see a decrease in the amount of instructional minutes lost due to pull out services.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Ross (lisa.ross@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teach higher thinking skills through the use of Thinking Maps to allow student to make their thinking visible and practice reasoning skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have found research from Robert Marzano in "The Art and Science of Teaching" and J. Hattie in "Visible Learning for Teachers" that shows students' 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 organizers to build a common language and consistent set of tools to be used school wide.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development to all teachers on Thinking Maps moving to the next steps of organizing writing and summarizing learning. Training will occur every two weeks from September through November 10th, with a refresher on January 10th.

Person Responsible	Lisa Ross (lisa.ross@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor small group instruction for differentiation of instruction and use of Thinking Maps to encourage higher order thinking weekly. Provide regular monthly feedback to teachers on implementation and impact based on student data.

Person Responsible	Lisa Ross (lisa.ross@indianriverschools.org)

Provide professional development and ongoing support for implementing higher order thinking skills in small group instruction quarterly.

Person Responsible	Lisa Ross (lisa.ross@indianriverschools.org)

Share disparities in academic recognition and academic grades amongst subgroups with teachers each nine weeks.

Person Responsible	Lisa Ross (lisa.ross@indianriverschools.org)

Continued and enhanced academic achievement analysis of each subgroup to determine needs, each quarter.

Person Responsible	Lisa Ross (lisa.ross@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2019 data we saw a need for improvement in our practices for recognizing efforts and achievements of all students, equitably, school wide.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students recognized during the school year for academic gains and proficiency, will increase, we will see an equitable distribution across all subgroups, including our African American and Exceptional Student Education subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Norris (jennifer.norris@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use our monthly shout outs, and awards celebrations to recognize students academic efforts and successes in relation to the learning goals/standards in all subgroups equitably.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Robert Marzano's research in "The Art and Science of Teaching" states that celebrating successes and recognizing students' progress in relation to the learning goal has a significant positive impact on student learning and motivation.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide feedback during preplanning to teachers on how students were being recognized last year.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Norris (jennifer.norris@indianriverschools.org)

Share disparities in academic recognition and academic grades amongst subgroups with teachers at preplanning, and at each nine weeks.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Norris (jennifer.norris@indianriverschools.org)

Provide professional development on implicit bias, in the first semester. Discuss what barriers might be causing us to recognize African American and ESE students at a lower rate than their peers.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Norris (jennifer.norris@indianriverschools.org)

Develop a plan for monthly recognition and develop an awards/celebrations committee, in the first nine weeks, to monitor that students are being recognized equitably.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Norris (jennifer.norris@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor impact of more frequent and equitable student recognition on student academic performance based on student data.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Norris (jennifer.norris@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will continue to focus on our magnet program utilizing the Core Knowledge Curriculum and connecting it to a STEAM approach that engages students in interdisciplinary, hands-on, and differentiated learning. Our data shows a need for increased learning gains in both math and reading, by teaching standards across content areas, using performance activities, hands on learning and STEAM approaches we will increase student's higher order thinking and reasoning skills, leading to increased learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on classroom observations and trend walk data we will see an increase in hands-on, cross curricular activities within classroom instruction happening on a quarterly basis. We will see an increase in differentiated output options for students to demonstrate their understanding.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Both Core Knowledge Curriculum by E.D. Hirsch and STEAM approaches use a hands on, interdisciplinary approach to learning. We will also utilize Thinking Maps for organizing and summarizing information and seeing the connections across content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Both Core Knowledge Curriculum by E.D. Hirsch and STEAM approaches have been researched and shown to have a positive impact on student learning and critical thinking skills by using an interdisciplinary approach to learning. We will integrate this with our professional development on Thinking Maps to provide a consistent structure for organizing thoughts and summarizing learning across content areas with our students. In Marzano's "Classroom Instruction That Works" research shows that hands on learning, that connects concepts across content areas has a positive impact on learning and retention of information.

Action Steps to Implement

Review the thematic concepts taught in Core Knowledge within each grade group quarterly to ensure they align with the Florida standards and district pacing.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Plan collaboratively with teams to align STEAM units and Core Knowledge units. Find the connections that go through content areas.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Plan differentiated ways for students to access and share learning each nine weeks. Determine how teachers will define mastery of the standards through STEAM and Core Knowledge units.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Clarify Core Knowledge and STEAM with teachers. Make sure they know and understand what we are doing and why it is beneficial to students. Share how it is impacting learning, connects to real world scenarios, and leads our students to deeper thinking. Share with parents and community at SAC meetings quarterly, in newsletters, on social media and share monthly STEAM activities with families to do at home.

Person Responsible	Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Apply for STEAM designation within our school district, submit portfolio in March.

Person Responsible   Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct fidelity walks to look for trends in Core Knowledge and STEAM implementation across campus. Are connections being made across content areas. Look for areas of strength and areas needing growth. Provide feedback to teachers monthly.

Person Responsible   Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor student performance data in ELA, Math and Science. Provide feedback to teachers and evaluate impact of STEAM and Core Knowledge units. Alter instruction based on current data findings quarterly.

Person Responsible   Casandra Flores (casandra.flores@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Other areas of need will be addressed within the school improvement in the additional goals.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

All grade levels and classrooms will implement Sanford Harmony, daily, in Tier 1, during a scheduled time. The scheduled times and practices are non-negotiable and will be reinforced through the strategies in our school's Equity Plan as well as our implementation of 10 days of Unity. Our 10 days of Unity will foster unifying our school community by building from individuals to school to our IRC community. PBIS practices and expectations will continue to be implemented throughout our campus.
Teachers and staff will receive training on Restorative Justice beliefs and practices and Sanford Harmony throughout the school year.
Parents will have the ability to be involved virtually through virtual classroom orientations, Facebook posts, virtual PTA posts & meetings, Twitter posts, classroom and grade level communication apps, Facebook Live school board updates.
Rosewood Magnet has created a Focus Area in Section III which addresses Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for this information.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$1,750.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0041 - Rosewood Magnet School	General Fund		$1,750.00
			Notes: Purchase 50 copies of Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain for our instructional staff to facilitate a school wide book study.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$2,940.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0041 - Rosewood Magnet School	General Fund		$2,940.00
			Notes: Purchase Ready Florida LAFS ELA books for our 3-5th grade students.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				$3,625.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0041 - Rosewood Magnet School	General Fund		$125.00
			Notes: Since we have new staff, we will purchase 5 more Higher Order Thinking Strategies Books so our new staff are able to participate in our school wide HOTS book study.			
	5100	750-Other Personal Services	0041 - Rosewood Magnet School	General Fund		$3,500.00
			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, into their instruction in order to differentiate for students at all levels.			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				$0.00
					Total:	$8,315.00