

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Rampello K 8 Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Rampello K 8 Magnet School

802 E WASHINGTON ST, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Justin Youmans

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	43%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Rampello K 8 Magnet School

802 E WASHINGTON ST, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>47%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>70%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

To become the Nation's leader in developing successful students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide an education that enables each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

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
Uppercue, Liz	Principal	Main instructional leader for school, responsible for school functioning
	Assistant Principal	Responsible for grades 6 through 8, student nutrition, safety
Young, Shelby-Roxanne	Assistant Principal	Responsible for grades K through 5, facilities, ELL, SAC, SIP, field trips

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2008, Justin Youmans

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.*

3

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.*

12

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)	Combination School KG-8
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)	43%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 .	

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	65	73	65	65	76	76	90	113	111	0	0	0	0	734
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	5	3	5	0	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	40
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	10	25	9	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	25	13	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	69	75	73	68	80	86	97	107	117	0	0	0	0	772
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	1	2	5	3	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	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	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	69	75	73	68	80	86	97	107	117	0	0	0	0	772
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	1	2	5	3	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	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	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	71%	57%	61%	69%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	59%	64%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	52%	54%	50%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	77%	55%	62%	69%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	77%	57%	59%	61%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	49%	52%	42%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	56%	50%	56%	51%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	77%	78%	79%	78%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
	2018	77%	53%	24%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	69%	53%	16%	54%	15%
	2018	65%	52%	13%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2019	72%	54%	18%	52%	20%
	2018	73%	52%	21%	51%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	72%	53%	19%	56%	16%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	54%	28%	62%	20%
	2018	79%	55%	24%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	57%	26%	64%	19%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	62%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
	2018	59%	54%	5%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	69%	49%	20%	55%	14%
	2018	70%	48%	22%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	79%	62%	17%	54%	25%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	54%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	66%	31%	35%	46%	20%
	2018	37%	29%	8%	45%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
	2018	61%	52%	9%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	59%	47%	12%	48%	11%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	50%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	67%	14%	71%	10%
2018	75%	65%	10%	71%	4%
Compare		6%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%
2018	97%	63%	34%	62%	35%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%

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	28	42	35	35	64	60	25	36			
ELL	54	65	55	71	83	82	10				
BLK	52	51	44	63	69	60	37	76	94		
HSP	78	76	65	83	82	68	55	65	100		
MUL	86	68		86	82						
WHT	84	74	50	89	82	73	79	100	100		
FRL	59	56	48	69	73	65	41	67	100		
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	32	46	44	29	47	44	15	25			
ELL	25	44	42	40	33						
BLK	46	53	42	50	51	37	25	62	91		
HSP	72	55	50	75	65	63	62	82	100		
MUL	73	59		85	73		80				
WHT	84	67	50	82	66	67	64	95	85		
FRL	52	52	41	58	54	44	34	63	86		
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	33	40	35	25	31	34		41			
ELL	18	36	40	29	43						
BLK	51	56	48	54	56	38	35	71	58		

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
HSP	75	65	54	71	51	42	47	73	76		
MUL	63	65		67	74						
WHT	81	70	50	83	73	43	75	95	84		
FRL	55	62	44	56	56	40	46	66	74		

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	70
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	700
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

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	61
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	73
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	81
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	81
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	64
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.

ELA learning gains for the bottom quartile; Science for ELL & SWD; ELA & Math achievement for SWD
SWD historically are scoring lower than other subgroups

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

Social studies for Hispanic students dropped from 82 to 65. For SWD, ELA Achievement dropped from 32 to 28, learning gains dropped from 46 to 42, and BQ dropped from 44 to 35. These declines could be due in part to having a new teacher in the ESE position and the range of levels within our SWD subgroup.

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.

Since there is no state data this year due to Covid-19 we will focus on the comparative data above. Social studies for Hispanic students dropped from 82 to 65. For SWD, ELA Achievement dropped from 32 to 28, learning gains dropped from 46 to 42, and BQ dropped from 44 to 35. These declines could be due in part to having a new teacher in the ESE position and the range of levels within our SWD subgroup.

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

We had the greatest gains in ELA and Math achievement and learning gains for Hispanic students, white students and multiracial students.

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

Students with disabilities and our bottom quartile are our biggest areas of concern.

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

1. Focus on rigor and engagement across all content areas
2. Focus on marking text and note-taking
3. Focus on BQ

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our area of focus is engagement through note-taking and writing across content areas. Note-taking ensures student focus and provides students with a method for synthesizing their learning. Writing across content areas ensures that students have the opportunity to process what they have learned, analyzing and synthesizing content.

Measurable Outcome: We will see gains across all subgroups in achievement and learning gains for the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Liz Uppercue (liz.uppercue@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: AVID Writing for Disciplinary Literacy: A Schoolwide Approach

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Writing is essential to help students process and retain their learning and if students cannot explain something in writing they don't know it well enough (AVID Writing for Disciplinary Literacy: A Schoolwide Approach, 2018).

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The BQ will be addressed through regular data chats on student performance with collaboration on next steps for students.

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.

We have the largest PTSA and SAC than we have had in years, growing more from last year. We will host four evening parent and community events through the year to highlight the learning happening and the skills of our student performance groups.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00