

Leon County Schools

Roberts Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Roberts Elementary School

5777 PIMLICO DR, Tallahassee, FL 32309

<https://www.leonschools.net/roberts>

Demographics

Principal: Kim Mcfarland

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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 Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]
* 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 Leon 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 Roberts Elementary School family will foster a safe, nurturing environment where students reach their fullest potential and become productive, responsible students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roberts Elementary School will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

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
McFarland, Kim	Principal	Mrs. McFarland, as the Principal, provides leadership as it pertains to the use of data-based decision-making. She ensures that the mission and vision of the school is supported and endorsed.
Shelton-Martin, Arecia	Assistant Principal	Dr. Shelton-Martin provides leadership as it pertains to the use of data-based decision-making. She ensures that the mission and vision of the school is supported and endorsed.
Corder, Beth	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Lunsford, Shayla	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Sanford, Shannan	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Bosarge, Jillian	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Timmons, Tiffanie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Doss, Judi	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Lee, Ava	Instructional Coach	Ms. Lee serves as the Math Coach. She provides targeted instruction to Tier 3 students. Additionally, she provides support in the area of mathematics to instructional faculty members.
Vinson, Kim	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Vinson serves as the Reading Coach. She provides targeted instruction to Tier 3 students. Additionally, she provides support in the area of reading to instructional faculty members.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2008, Kim Mcfarland

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

845

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	138	145	125	137	129	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	823
Attendance below 90 percent	34	20	19	21	17	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	9	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	6	11	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	128	138	141	135	155	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816
Attendance below 90 percent	11	17	13	7	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	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	0	0	0	3	4	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	6	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - 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	128	138	141	135	155	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816
Attendance below 90 percent	11	17	13	7	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	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	0	0	0	3	4	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	6	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	78%			83%	57%	57%	81%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%			60%	54%	58%	65%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%			66%	47%	53%	58%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	77%			86%	64%	63%	80%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	54%			75%	63%	62%	62%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%			63%	45%	51%	43%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	73%			76%	52%	53%	86%	52%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	86%	61%	25%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	57%	29%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	89%	63%	26%	62%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	84%	66%	18%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	61%	22%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The data showing below is compiled from the 2020-2021 iReady progress monitoring data for our school. The Science data is compiled from our district science assessment.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38	59	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	53	73
	Students With Disabilities	27	48	67
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	54	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	49	72
	Students With Disabilities	19	38	55
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	69	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	62	74
	Students With Disabilities	29	53	63
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27	58	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	49	72
	Students With Disabilities	17	38	64
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	78	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	72	75
	Students With Disabilities	52	59	66
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27	55	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	37	65
	Students With Disabilities	12	34	61
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	70	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	61	64
	Students With Disabilities	38	60	62
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	54	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	38	57
	Students With Disabilities	16	32	59
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	66	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	61	64
	Students With Disabilities	46	58	61
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	59	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	52	64
	Students With Disabilities	31	47	58
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	52	66	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	61	62
	Students With Disabilities	27	41	49
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	33	36	40	48	36		42				
BLK	52	40		38	20		53				
HSP	90			85							
MUL	65			74							
WHT	84	63	67	84	63	60	79				
FRL	51	44		42	25		57				
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	45	50	54	52	65	61	41				
BLK	53	48	43	73	72	68	15				
HSP	89	69		84	63		75				
MUL	89	64		89	83						
WHT	86	61	69	87	75	62	84				
FRL	76	61	67	77	61	61	59				
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	47	58	46	52	55	48	57				
BLK	43	42	38	30	26	21	56				
HSP	75	69		70	56						
MUL	95	79		86	57		100				
WHT	85	67	62	87	68	53	92				
FRL	70	59	57	62	57	39	73				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	431
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	41
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	88
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	70
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	
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	71
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

An analysis of the data from the 2020-2021 school term compared with our last assessment data from the 2018-2019 school term, revealed a decrease in proficiency scores across grade all grade levels, subgroups and content areas except for 5th grade ELA scores. ELA scores decreased by 9% in third grade and 7% in fourth grade. Math scores decreased by 18% in third grade, 4% in fourth grade and 3% in fifth grade. Also, science scores decreased by 3% in 5th grade.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The area that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement are the third grade mathematics scores. The scores in this area decreased from 89% on the 2018-2019 assessment to 71% on the 2021-2022 assessment.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The overarching factor that resulted in the decreased scores was the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result of the pandemic, our modes of instruction changed for a significant portion of our school population. At the beginning of the 2020-2021 school term, 30% of our students were enrolled in the digital academy. As the year progressed, we finished the year with 9.5% of our students enrolled in the digital academy. As a result, 20% of our student population received instruction from two curricular models. Additionally, we experienced several staffing changes that caused instructional shifts for students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The fifth grade ELA scores showed the most improvement. The fifth grade ELA scores improved from 76% on the 2018-2019 assessment data to 79% on the 2020-2021 assessment.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

During the 2020-2021 school term, a new instructional program was added that was not offered during the 2019-2020 school term. The FLVS program was added to our curriculum. Additionally, our reading coach served as one of our fifth grade ELA instructors. As a result, she was able to provide daily support and assistance to the students and colleagues.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate learning, the following programs/strategies will be utilized: walk to read, gifted program and technology courses. In the walk to read model, students are grouped based on skills. As a result, teachers are easily able to accelerate learning at the level appropriate for each student. Also, our gifted program provides opportunities for students to accelerate learning. In addition, students in grades four and five receive instruction in technology that allows them to earn industry certifications.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers are provided professional development opportunities in the Walk to Read program, industry certifications and techniques that can be used to recognize and provide opportunities to accelerate learning within their classrooms. The aforementioned opportunities can be provided via the following methods: school district trainings and offerings, school-wide trainings and/or grade-level trainings.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We have implemented school-based team that will focus on specific curricular areas. As a result, teams with representatives from each grade level are analyzing data and providing recommendations for continued improvement. Our first team is focused on writing. The team has developed a plan to gradually implement a school-wide K-5 writing program to address an area of need. As the year progresses, we will expand to create additional academic area teams.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A review of our assessment data from previous years and teacher focus groups, revealed that the area of writing is an opportunity of improvement for our school. Students in grades 4 and 5 are assessed in writing on the FSA. Based on the scores from the previous school term, the 4th grade scores decreased slightly. The 5th grade scores showed a slight improvement. However, the goal is to see a 1 point average score increase at each grade level. In 4th grade, the average score would improve from 6.06 to 7.06 points out of ten total points. In 5th grade, the goal is for the average score to increase from 5.93 to 6.93 points out of ten total points.

Measureable Outcome: In grades 4 and 5, we plan to achieve a 3% increase in the area of writing on the FSA.

Monitoring: Quarterly, school-wide writing assessments will be conducted with all K-5 grade students. The assessments will be scored by teacher teams using a standardized rubric.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in ELA classes to ensure that the needs of the students are met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers that consistently and adequately differentiate instruction coupled with ongoing progress monitoring acknowledge student diversity and utilize formal and information assessment to gauge impact of their decisions and achieve measurable student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Development of the Writing Focus Team
Person Responsible: Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Classroom instruction in the area of writing
Person Responsible: Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Quarterly Writing Assessments
Person Responsible: Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Assessment review by the Writing Focus Team
Person Responsible: Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A review of our assessment data from previous years and teacher focus groups, revealed that the area of science is an opportunity of improvement for our school. Our goal is to improve our science proficiency on the FCAT Science assessment from 73% to 76%.

Measureable Outcome: In grade 5, we plan to achieve a 3% increase in the area of science on the FCAT Science Assessment.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored by beginning of the year, middle of the year and end of the year district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in science classes to ensure that the needs of the students are met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers that consistently and adequately differentiate instruction coupled with ongoing progress monitoring acknowledge student diversity and utilize formal and information assessment to gauge impact of their decisions and achieve measurable student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom instruction in the area of science

Person Responsible Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Science progress monitoring assessments administered

Person Responsible Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Data analysis and review with teachers

Person Responsible Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The moderate ranking that we received on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org data indicates that an opportunity for growth for is our school culture and environment. The goal is to decrease instances of bullying and threatening behavior by providing more opportunities to teach students about equity and diversity.

Measureable Outcome: As a result of our efforts, the goal is to have a 5% reduction in the amount of bullying and harassment referrals written.

Monitoring: FOCUS data will be analyzed to monitor the progress and outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We are utilizing the house system as the strategy for this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The house system provides all students with a smaller community within larger community on our school campus. By created micro-communities, we are helping students to form relationships with their peers and teachers that they may not otherwise have an opportunity to connect with during the school day. Additionally, the house system provides students with a place to belong, opportunities to collaborate with their peers, leadership opportunities and a sense of tradition.

Action Steps to Implement

House System Presentation for all faculty members

Person Responsible Arcia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

Sorting ceremonies for New Students

Person Responsible Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

Monthly House Meetings

Person Responsible Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In a comparison of discipline data across the state using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org data, Roberts Elementary school is ranked as a moderate elementary school. Our violent incident ranking is 0.46 per 100 students. The incidents that resulted in the ranking are bullying and threats. We are ranked very low for property incidents and drug/public order incidents. As a school community, we work diligently to address bullying and harassment. We have implemented a House System and teach students that we are a community of learners. Additionally, our morning news program includes segments on bullying, harassment, kindness, compassion, respect, diversity and inclusion. We utilize these strategies to reinforce the concept of respect for your fellow student in an effort to mitigate incidents of this nature.

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.

The mission of Roberts Elementary School is to foster a safe, nurturing environment where students reach their fullest potential and become productive, responsible students. In order to achieve this mission, we recognize the importance of all school stakeholders. All members of the Roberts Elementary School community are valued and are empowered to fully participate in our school. Our school theme is One Team. One Dream. Umoja! and we value collaboration. We utilize a House System that reinforces our expectations for our school environment, provides students with a community and creates an overall positive school culture. As a school, we help to build capacity for parental involvement and sustained community engagement. It is our belief that strong home and school relationships serve as the foundation for positive outcomes as it pertains to academic achievement. We communicate with parents via the Remind app, Zoom or Microsoft Teams meetings, phone calls, conferences and newsletters. During the COVID-19 pandemic, we have shifted our way of work to offer virtual opportunities for parents and community partners to connect and engage with us at open house, curriculum nights, PTO meetings, classroom and other events.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The following stakeholders are involved with promoting a positive culture and environment at Roberts Elementary School: faculty and staff members, students, parents/guardians and community stakeholders.

The aforementioned stakeholders serve an integral role for our school. The administrative team plans develops and communicates the mission and vision of the school to all stakeholders. All faculty and staff members serve as the ambassadors for our school and ensure the implementation of the mission and vision. Students are the center of our work and connect all stakeholders. Furthermore, students are taught and shown that they are integral to the culture and school environment. Parents and community members are true partners and assist in the creation and sustaining of a positive school culture and environment by organizing, planning and participating in school events and collaborating with faculty members to meet academic goals.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00