Robinson Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Robinson Elementary School

4801 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33567

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Timothy Delgado   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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

Robinson Elementary School

4801 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33567

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

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

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.

J. S. Robinson will provide all students the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

J. S. Robinson will provide all students the best education in the county.

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
Wilkerson, Alicia	Principal	Instructional Leader
Gilmore, Katherine	Assistant Principal	
Bikowski, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	
Roberts, Lynn	Instructional Media	
Der, Judy	Instructional Coach	
Hicks, Kyisaiah	School Counselor	
Valentino, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	
Shepherd, Kari	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Timothy Delgado

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.*
49

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	79	74	90	108	86	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539
Attendance below 90 percent	12	9	14	15	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/25/2020

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	85	78	93	98	98	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	19	14	15	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	5	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	85	78	93	98	98	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	19	14	15	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	12	5	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	5	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	45%	52%	57%	37%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	45%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	50%	53%	41%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	50%	54%	63%	51%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	57%	62%	59%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	46%	51%	40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	50%	53%	43%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	55%	-7%	58%	-10%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	39%	54%	-15%	62%	-23%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	18%					
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison	-22%					

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	51%	-19%	53%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	45	44	44	61	42	26				
ELL	35	51	48	44	58	45	18				
BLK	44	45		38	27						
HSP	39	52	51	46	54	43	29				
WHT	59	62	50	61	59	20	49				
FRL	42	54	52	48	53	40	33				
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	29	41	36	44	46	41	43				
ELL	28	49	56	40	51	44	21				
BLK	58	50		42	50						
HSP	34	50	57	47	51	35	36				
WHT	66	66		59	55	36	63				
FRL	43	52	55	48	50	38	39				
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	9	43	53	36	57	36	27				
ELL	15	32	44	42	54	39	28				
BLK	23			23							
HSP	27	38	43	47	58	33	40				
WHT	59	61	45	65	63		58				
FRL	31	44	44	47	57	41	38				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	45
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 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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	51
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	47
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.

For the 2018 - 2019 the data component the showed the lowest performance was Science. We feel as a team one of the factors that led to this decrease was a change of science teachers. Our 5th grade Science teacher that we had taught 80% of the students. She had taught science for over 15 years. She had a promotion and we had a new hire. It took a couple months for the new hire to be fully processed. So we have 80% of our students being taught by a brand new teacher and 20% of the students being taught by a teacher who was new to 5th grade.

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

In the 2018 - 2019 school year data, the greatest decline was also in science. We feel as a team one of the factors that led to this decrease was a change of science teachers. Our 5th grade Science teacher taught
80% of the students. She had taught science for over 15 years. She had a promotion and we had a new hire. It took a couple months for the new hire to be fully processed. So we have 80% of our students being taught by a brand new teacher and 20% of the students being taught by a teacher who was new to 5th grade.

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.

When looking at the state averages for the 2018 - 2019 school year, in both Math and Reading in the third grade there was a 23% gap between what Robinson scored for their proficient students compared to
that of the State. While our 3rd Grade FSA scores show a wide gap between Robinson's data and the state data, our iReady 3rd grade math and reading scores show an increase in proficiency from the beginning to the end of the 2018-2019 school year. These students are continuing to show growth from K-3. In reading, a lack of foundational skills and vocabulary directly correlated to students being able to fluently read and comprehend text at a proficient level. The achievement gap begins to widen when 1st-5th grade teachers have to teach foundational skills below grade level expectations.

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

In Math learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25% we went up 1%. In the
school year 2018-2019, our math teachers focused on small group differentiated
instruction, with an extra focus on our tier 3 bottom quartile students. As a result, we
had an increase in learning gains points as well as bottom quartile learning gains. Additionally, our Math resource teacher held small group instruction with bottom quartile students.

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

As a leadership team we feel that word study support, vocabulary knowledge, a need for
wide reading of genres are all areas of concerns to these students.
Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement

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

1. Create a Culture for Professional Development.
2. Create a Culture for shared accountability for both students and staff through monitoring.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Create a culture of shared accountability through aligned standard based instruction.Need to improve standard based instruction to increase proficiency and student gains across all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase in proficiency and student gains by looking at i-Ready scores, SIPPS, Achieve 3000, and EOY assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Wilkerson (alicia.wilkerson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Involve stakeholders in supporting our instructional practice. Extended Learning opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Need to support the parental understanding to support the instructional focus. Need to collaborate and support the instructional staff to align standard based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Bi-weekly Professional Learning Community meetings monitored through weekly agenda.
2. Monthly/Quarterly assessments monitored through IReady, SIPPS, Achieve 3000, and School City.
3. Progress monitoring of the multiple data points through monthly MTSS meetings and quarterly PSLT/CST
meetings.
4. Weekly Walk-throughs with teacher feedback.

Person Responsible	Alicia Wilkerson (alicia.wilkerson@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Additional monitoring and support of our Black African Americans students due to the need to improve standard based instruction to increase proficiency and student gains across all grade levels, including FSAA.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase EWS to 41% or higher
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Wilkerson (alicia.wilkerson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase parental improvement Reading Coach, Math Coach, and Science Coach will serve the bottom quartile students two days a week. Black African American students will be assigned to day tutors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning PLC will progress monitor the Black subgroup Quarterly monitor Black subgroups through report card reviews.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Quarterly PLC monitoring of Black subgroup and through report card reviews.
2. Administration will monitor all formative data for Black subgroup
3. Weekly Walk Through

Person Responsible	Alicia Wilkerson (alicia.wilkerson@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will meet throughout the year and discuss the priorities that the team has decided upon. The team will bring data that supports what is happening at the school and share what is going well and what can be done to improve.

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.

Robinson goes above and beyond to build positive school culture. Throughout the school year we have monthly character traits. The guidance counselor visits classroom and gives character education lessons to all grade levels that correspond with the trait. We also have ROAD and mindfulness expectations. These are rules that all students learn about in the first weeks of school. All teacher, students, faculty are involved in making sure they are being followed. Our PBIS team offers a monthly store where students can spend their earned JSR bucks. Additionally, we have inclusive semester mystery events and assemblies to reinforce desired behaviors. We continually build on being culturally responsive in instruction and leadership to address the intersectional academic, socio-economic, and social-emotional needs of our diverse population.

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: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				$203.37
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1111	239-Other	3681 - Robinson Elementary School	Other	0.0	$203.37
			Notes: School wide fundraisers to enhance our learning environment.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				$0.00
					Total:	$203.37