Roosevelt Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Roosevelt Elementary School

3205 S FERDINAND AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Denise Wheatley

Start Date for this Principal: 5/10/2010

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (76%) 2015-16: A (70%)
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

Roosevelt Elementary School

3205 S FERDINAND AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[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	No	9%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

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.

The mission of Roosevelt Elementary is to provide differentiated instruction supported by an enriched curriculum that fosters academic excellence and self-reflection.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roosevelt students will be compassionate, curious learners with the confidence to embrace life's opportunities

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
Dickens, Christina	Principal	Over sees the overall functions of the school and learning community.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 5/10/2010, Denise Wheatley

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.*

6

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
44

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (76%) 2015-16: A (70%)
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	114	119	117	127	135	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	4	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	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	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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	131	121	129	147	107	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	757
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 or Math	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	131	121	129	147	107	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	757
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	86%	52%	57%	90%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	55%	58%	81%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	50%	53%	74%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	54%	63%	86%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	57%	62%	68%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	46%	51%	56%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	84%	50%	53%	79%	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	88%	52%	36%	58%	30%
	2018	83%	53%	30%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	55%	29%	58%	26%
	2018	91%	55%	36%	56%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	87%	54%	33%	56%	31%
	2018	83%	51%	32%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	85%	54%	31%	62%	23%
	2018	82%	55%	27%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	57%	30%	64%	23%
	2018	92%	57%	35%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	86%	54%	32%	60%	26%
	2018	87%	54%	33%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	85%	51%	34%	53%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	79%	52%	27%	55%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	44	41	50	62	44						
ELL	80			60							
ASN	83			92							
HSP	66	48	40	68	45		73				
MUL	79	67		79	67						
WHT	90	71	73	91	82	74	87				
FRL	69	56		66	61		73				
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	37	50	38	69	59	45	25				
HSP	73	71	64	79	83	60	81				
MUL	89	82		83	91						
WHT	89	76	72	90	80	70	80				
FRL	72	65	46	73	72	65	65				
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	29	65	57	62	47						
ELL	67			50							
ASN	91			91							
HSP	81	66	57	74	59	43	54				
MUL	94			81							
WHT	91	83	78	88	70	66	84				
FRL	81	77	69	65	53	47	62				

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	75

ESSA Federal Index	
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	600
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	70
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	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	73
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	65
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.

Comparing the 2018-2019 data,
The learning gains in math dropped from 81% to 78%. -3
The lowest quartile in math dropped from 67% to 64% -3
The learning gains in ELA dropped from 75% to 68% -7
The lowest quartile in ELA dropped from 69% to 63% -6

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

Greatest decline was in the are of ELA in learning gains and the bottom quartile.
The factors that contributed were the lack of strong PLC meetings

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.

In all areas, we are above the state average, however, we are in a position where we need to show more growth.

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

Science was most improved as teachers learned to analyze the standards to ensure they were teaching the correct concepts in science. We gained 4 achievement percentage growth.

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

Identifying what the standards are asking and being able to have teachers target the intended standards in all lessons.

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

1. PLC meetings will be more effective in identifying and meeting the needs of all children.
2. The bottom quartile will be monitored more closely by each classroom teacher and focused on during instruction.
3. Targeted walkthrough will provide effective feedback to teachers.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The bottom quartile has not increased. Our neediest students need to be instructed using a differentiated approach to meet state standards.
Measurable Outcome:	The PLC' s for each grade level will meet to discuss strategies to use with the students who are not increasing in their achievement areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Dickens (christina.dickens@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Researched based ELA programs will be used and monitored through the testing program where data will be available soon after testing. The PLC's will identify the strategies and standards to be focused on in small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Assessments are used to monitor students at all times. iReady will provide additional data as needed in order to prescribe specific instructional materials and lessons that focus on deficit areas.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC's and Leadership team will monitor the monthly meetings. There will be a monthly MTSS meeting to monitor the students who have to have additional time for learning.

Person Responsible	Denise Wheatley (denise.wheatley@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The math scores have been inconsistent in all grade levels. The state scores have declined and will be monitored more closely with the new curriculum and process for PLC monitoring.
Measurable Outcome:	The achievement in math will increase by 5 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Dickens (christina.dickens@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady lessons, small group intervention groups for math will focus on the data and plan for the groups of children needing interventions after every testing session.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A keen focus on the data by each teacher will ensure that the small group processes for teaching will support achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

After each testing session, students will be regrouped to attend small group instruction for areas in need of support in order to learn the material and be successful on the tests.

Person Responsible	Denise Wheatley (denise.wheatley@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The staff will complete a "PLC Status" survey. The PLC process will get a new start with a leadership team focused on PLC meetings and processes. The focus will be on the growth and low quartile in reading and math.
The meetings at grade levels will put a hyper focus on the lowest quartile and will follow the data from iReady each time it is adminstered.
During the team meetings, there will be a focus on breaking standards down for effective teaching and the PLC meetings will focus on the individual student progress and monitoring with fidelity.

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.

By maintaining a consistent focus on the goals and including the members of the school staff in the decision making process, the culture of the school will grow. The leadership team will set forth expectations and will ensure that the teachers have the skills to be successful. The data retrieved during classroom walk through observations will highlight the positives and areas to develop. Guiding teachers in a manner that shows the how they can achieve has a strong affect on school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.