The One Room School House Project

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	
* 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 Alachua 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 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 2/1/2017, Sarah Sonberg

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.*
4

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
14

Demographic Data

2020-21 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 Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	30	28	34	26	30	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
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	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Total**
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	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					
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					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
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						
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	
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 was 46%. This is 13% higher then last year but significantly lower then the district and state. There was a new science teacher.

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

All components had an increase with the exception of Math Achievement which dropped by 6%. We attribute this to new teachers teaching new material.

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 had the greatest gap being 12% lower then the state. We attribute this to new teachers teaching new material.

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

Our greatest improvement was Math in the Lowest 25th Percentile. We saw a 75% gain. We attribute this to the intense after school tutoring program that we provided.

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

Math is still a concern at the school. We also will need to monitor science scores.

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math and science were our lowest areas of achievement therefore we feel that these subjects require the most attention and change in strategy for the new school year.
Measureable Outcome:	Math and Science Achievement on this year's FSA equivalent or greater than state average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Sonberg (s.sonberg@orsh.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We have increased our math blocks to 90 minutes minimum. Implemented more math intervention in the classrooms and have a focus on math vocabulary across the curriculum. We have increased the science block for 5th graders to 90 minutes as well. We have also implemented more hands on science projects across all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading tends to receive the most focus as it is the foundation for all other subjects. We will be using state approved curriculum testing but have found that standard curriculum testing does not adequately prepare students

Action Steps to Implement

-Make changes to schedule
-Create science fair curriculum and procedures
-Create science and math vocabulary curriculum for all grade levels

Person Responsible	Sarah Sonberg (s.sonberg@orsh.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All priorities identified have been addresses above. There are no remaining priorities.

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 of our teachers will have training in youth mental health and maintain any ongoing training to stay current. We have a social worker on campus every week to help assist with any social-emotional needs that may arise with any students/families/staff. We have ongoing communication with stakeholders for input and feedback pertaining to the school.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				$150,143.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$117,834.68
			Notes: Salaries for Intervention Teachers/Paraprofessionals			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$4,480.00
			Notes: The purchase of Freckle - an ELA, Math and Science program for Kindergarten through 5th grade that helps prepare students on the state standards.			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$2,636.00
			Notes: The purchase of Reflex Math - a math program for 2nd through 5th grade that helps prepare students with the math state standards.			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$4,966.00
			Notes: The purchase of Achieve 3000 - an ELA program for 3rd through 5th grade that helps prepare students with the ELA state standards.			

	5100	520-Textbooks	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$5,994.00
			Notes: The purchase of Focused Reading and Math Intervention Kits for kindergarten through 5th grade to support student instruction.			
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$12,272.00
			Notes: The implementation of an EDI program and summer school for those students that need extra support.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$1,960.32
			Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplement			
					Total:	**$150,143.00**