

Achua County Public Schools

The One Room School House Project



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	13
Budget to Support Goals	15

The One Room School House Project

4180 NE 15TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

<http://www.orsh.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Sonberg

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: B 2014-15: C 2013-14: F
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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

N/A

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 The One Room School House is to extend the opportunity for school choice to at risk Alachua County school students who may not otherwise have a chance to participate in a small, highly rigorous, family oriented, and academically intensive educational experience.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of The One Room School House is to offer the opportunity to at risk Alachua County school students to participate in a small, highly rigorous, family oriented, and academically intensive educational experience.

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
Sonberg, Sarah	Principal	Overall supervision and planning for all aspects of school functions.
Minsavage, Jeanne	Assistant Principal	Testing coordination

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	45	45	35	40	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
Attendance below 90 percent	12	4	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	6	10	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/19/2019

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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	6	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	63%	59%	57%	63%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	57%	58%	60%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	49%	53%	67%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	50%	60%	63%	56%	64%	62%
Math Learning Gains	59%	61%	62%	40%	58%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	49%	51%	33%	45%	47%
Science Achievement	46%	57%	53%	33%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	45 (0)	45 (0)	35 (0)	40 (0)	20 (0)	20 (0)	0 (0)	205 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 ()	4 ()	2 ()	3 ()	2 ()	1 ()	0 ()	24 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 ()	6 (0)	10 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	26 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	9 (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	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	62%	55%	7%	56%	6%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	58%	-6%	62%	-10%
	2018	75%	60%	15%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	60%	-23%	64%	-27%
	2018	47%	60%	-13%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	55%	-9%	53%	-7%
	2018	33%	55%	-22%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
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
BLK	59	60	80	43	54	70	36				
WHT	80	69		55	69						
FRL	52	55	80	43	53	73	39				

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
BLK	52	50		52	31						

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
WHT	76	69		62	44						
FRL	61	59	73	54	43	36	33				

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	60
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	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	57
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	56
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

Science Achievement = 46%. This component is 13% higher than the previous year. A new teacher was teaching Science last year.

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

All components are up or even except Math Achievement which dropped 6%. We attribute this to new teachers teaching material for the first time.

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

Math Achievement was 12% lower than state average. We attribute this to new teachers teaching material for the first time.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile gained 75%. We attribute this to an After School Tutoring program.

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

Math is still an area of concern especially in 2nd grade. There are several student in that grade level that have a failing grade at this point in the school year.

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

1. Science Achievement
2. Math Achievement
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Since this was our lowest area of achievement we feel that science requires the most attention and change in strategy for the new school year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science Achievement on FSA equivalent or greater than state average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sarah Sonberg (s.sonberg@orsh.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We have increased the length of our science class to 90 minutes and moved our most experienced science teacher to 5th grade. In the lower grades we have instituted a standards based science fair project to be completed in each grading period as well as increased lab and class time for science classes. Weekly tests will have additional FSA preparatory items. Teach science vocabulary across the curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Language Arts and Math have received the lion's share of time and resources in the past decade due to their stature in high stakes testing. We have lengthened our school day to provide an equal amount of attention to Science. We feel that the teacher with the most experience and education in science teaching is best suited to make improvements. Science fair projects are aimed at reinforcing standards and creating student motivation towards science learning. We have found that standard curriculum testing does not adequately prepare students for the particularities of the FSA format and depth of thinking skills required. We feel that using science vocabulary more often and more broadly will solidify science concepts for students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make changes to teaching staff 2. Make changes to schedule 3. Create Science Fair curriculum and procedures 4. Create weekly tests with FSA preparatory items 5. Create science vocabulary curriculum for all grade levels
Person Responsible	Sarah Sonberg (s.sonberg@orsh.net)

#2	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	Since this was our lowest area of achievement we feel that science requires the most attention and change in strategy for the new school year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math Achievement on FSA equivalent or greater than state average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sarah Sonberg (s.sonberg@orsh.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We have increased the length of our math class to 90 minutes and moved our most experienced math teacher to the upper grades. In the lower grades we have instituted a math intervention. Weekly tests will have additional FSA preparatory items. Teach math vocabulary across the curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Language Arts and Math have received the lion's share of time and resources in the past decade due to their stature in high stakes testing. We feel that the teacher with the most experience and education in math teaching is best suited to make improvements. We have found that standard curriculum testing does not adequately prepare students for the particularities of the FSA format. We feel that using math vocabulary more often and more broadly will solidify math concepts for students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make changes to teaching staff 2. Make changes to schedule 3. Create weekly tests with FSA preparatory items 5. Create math vocabulary curriculum for all grade levels
Person Responsible	Sarah Sonberg (s.sonberg@orsh.net)

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)

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

The school plans to hold several parent involvement nights for the parents, teachers and students get together for activities in reading, math, science and community building. After these event parent fill out input forms that will be used for future planning.

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

All teachers and staff will be trained with at least 8 hours of youth mental health. We are also working with a certified psychologist who will assist in identifying students with social-emotional needs. The school is also participating in Sandy Hook.

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

The school provides Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten as well as a kindergarten orientation to help young students in the community familiarize themselves with One Room. When students leave the school we can reach out to the new school to help with any necessary transition information.

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

Before the school year begins, during pre-planning and when necessary throughout the school year, the leadership team in conjunction with all school personnel meet to schedule teachers and classes, Title I tutoring, Title II professional development, psychological services, curricular needs including materials and activities, before and after school programs, technical and computer resources, programs and support, and all other school activities with an eye to maximizing resources towards maximizing high student performance on state standards. School leadership meets with all personnel to get input on needs and plans for each classroom and school program. The school leadership teams uses this information to plan the school program and budget around the most important needs or deficits existing at the school. The persons responsible for this planning are the principal, the board representative, the technology specialist, media specialist, and the Title I lead teacher

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

The STEAM program brings in speakers and demonstrations of engineering and science activities that promote awareness of technology.

Part V: Budget

1 III.A Areas of Focus: Science Achievement							\$3,125.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title II		\$3,125.00	
			<i>Notes: We have purchased a science program for 4th and 5th graders that will help prepare students on the science standards.</i>				
2 III.A Areas of Focus: Math Achievement							\$3,125.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
			0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title II		\$3,125.00	
			<i>Notes: We have purchased a math program for Kindergarten through 6th grade graders that will help prepare students on the science standards. We have also have intervention teachers for pull-out/push-in for math.</i>				
Total:						\$6,250.00	