

2021-22 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 | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

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: 7/9/2020

| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 43% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Infe | ormation* |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |
| | |

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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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 | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Hillsborough - 4251 - Rampello K 8 Magnet School - 2021-22 SIP

Rampello K 8 Magnet School

802 E WASHINGTON ST, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Gr (per MSID F | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvant | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Combination S KG-8 | School | No | | 43% |
| Primary Servic (per MSID F | •• | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Ec | lucation | No | | 68% |
| School Grades Histo | ry | | | |
| Year Grade | 2020-21 | 2019-20 A | 2018-19 A | 2017-18 A |
| School Board Approv | /al | | | |

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.

Create life-long learners who will be the leaders of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will provide a safe harbor that encourages personal growth through academic excellence, individual determination, and service to others.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Norman, Aliya | Assistant Principal | Oversee SAC School Improvement Plan, participate and advise during SAC monthly meetings. Responsible for grades K-5, student nutrition, SAC, SIP and field trips. |
| Youmans, Justin | Principal | Final approval of SAC decisions. Main instructional leader for school. Responsible for overall school functioning. |
| Saddler, Jeanine | Assistant Principal | Advise SAC decisions, advisor for the School Behavior Plan. Responsible for grades 6-8, safety, and custodial. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/9/2020, 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.

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

773

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year. 4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 81 | 71 | 72 | 63 | 85 | 85 | 108 | 94 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 773 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 14 | 5 | 17 | 14 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 25 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 25 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | eve | I | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | | | | | Tetel |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | l | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 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 | | |

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| | | | | | | Gra | de l | _evel | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|------|-------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | к | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| 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:

| la dia stan | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 71% | 57% | 61% | 66% | 59% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66% | 56% | 59% | 59% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51% | 52% | 54% | 45% | 49% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 77% | 55% | 62% | 68% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 77% | 57% | 59% | 60% | 53% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 64% | 49% | 52% | 50% | 47% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 56% | 50% | 56% | 50% | 51% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 81% | 77% | 78% | 76% | 79% | 77% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 Comparisor |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 52% | 20% | 58% | 14% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 80% | 55% | 25% | 58% | 22% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -72% | | | • | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 54% | 7% | 56% | 5% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -80% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 53% | 16% | 54% | 15% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -61% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 54% | 18% | 52% | 20% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -69% | | | · · | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |

| | ELA | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 53% | 19% | 56% | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -72% | | | | | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparisor |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | _ |
| | 2019 | 82% | 54% | 28% | 62% | 20% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | • | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 83% | 57% | 26% | 64% | 19% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -82% | | | • | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 54% | 9% | 60% | 3% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -83% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 49% | 20% | 55% | 14% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -63% | | | • | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 62% | 17% | 54% | 25% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -69% | | | • | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 31% | 35% | 46% | 20% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -79% | | | I | |

| | | | SCIENC | СЕ | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 51% | 2% | 53% | 0% |
| Cohort Corr | parison | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 47% | 12% | 48% | 11% |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | -53% | | | | |

| | BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | | | | | |
| 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | CIVIC | SEOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 81% | 67% | 14% | 71% | 10% |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | • | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| | | ALGEE | RA EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 63% | 37% | 61% | 39% |
| | | GEOME | TRY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady data was utilized to progress monitor the data below. Content area district formative assessments were utilized to progress monitor for middle school.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 60 | 75 | 87 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 69 | 54 | 40 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 57 | 43 | 57 |
| | English Language Learners | 50 | 100 | 100 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25 | 54 | 77 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | 46 | 0.08 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 57 | 57 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 60 | Spring 73 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 40 | 60 | 73 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 40 52 | 60 56 | 73 56 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 40 52 43 | 60 56 71 | 73 56 71 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 40 52 43 40 | 60 56 71 60 | 73 56 71 80 |
| | ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantagedStudents WithDisabilitiesEnglish LanguageLearnersNumber/%ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantaged | Fall 40 52 43 40 Fall | 60 56 71 60 Winter | 73 56 71 80 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 40 52 43 40 Fall 21 | 60 56 71 60 Winter 46 | 73 56 71 80 Spring 61 |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 59 | 75 | 85 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 45 | 21 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33 | 67 | 50 |
| | English Language Learners | 33 | 100 | 100 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25 | 45 | 74 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 0.08 | 11 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 33 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | | Orduc 4 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 58 | Spring 75 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 50 | 58 | 75 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 50 46 | 58 30 | 75 28 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 50 46 29 0 Fall | 58 30 50 0 Winter | 75 28 43 33 Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 50 46 29 0 | 58 30 50 0 | 75 28 43 33 |
| | ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantagedStudents WithDisabilitiesEnglish LanguageLearnersNumber/%ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantaged | Fall 50 46 29 0 Fall | 58 30 50 0 Winter | 75 28 43 33 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 50 46 29 0 Fall 33 | 58 30 50 0 Winter 51 | 75 28 43 33 Spring 67 |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 51 | 61 | 70 |
| English Language | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 19 | .07 |
| Arts | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 20 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 48 | 59 | 65 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 19 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 50 | 100 | 50 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 67 | 59 | n/a |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 57 | 45 | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | 83 | 81 | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | 39 | n/a |
| | | Grade 6 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22 | 25 | 29 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 | 16 | 18 |
| 1 4 6 | Students With Disabilities | 31 | 34 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |

| | | Grade 7 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 23 | 29 | 32 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 | 18 | 20 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 34 | 38 | 41 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Civics | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |

| | | Grade 8 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 27 | 34 | 36 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 17 | 21 | 25 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37 | 42 | 44 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Subgroup Data Review

| | 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 27 | 31 | 28 | 29 | 33 | 24 | 17 | 53 | | | |
| ELL | 54 | 61 | | 51 | 43 | | 60 | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 43 | 27 | 39 | 31 | 22 | 25 | 39 | 67 | | |
| HSP | 72 | 68 | 62 | 67 | 53 | 44 | 72 | 70 | 93 | | |
| MUL | 59 | 47 | | 52 | 47 | | 71 | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | 66 | 59 | 77 | 61 | 46 | 76 | 81 | 79 | | |
| FRL | 49 | 51 | 35 | 45 | 40 | 25 | 48 | 47 | 75 | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | | |

| | 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 |
| 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 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 501 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 95% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 54 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 37 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 67 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 55 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 69 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 46 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

A trend that emerges are BQ student learning gains are consistently lower. Students with disabilities are also an area of opportunity in both ELA and Math achievement. Science is an area of opportunity for SWD and ELL.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our BQ students and students with disabilities demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

COVID was a big contributing factor. We had inconsistent instruction as a result of eLearning and quarantine which resulted in learning gaps. We will be implementing learning acceleration across content areas K-8.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We had the greatest gains in ELA and Math achievement for learning improvements.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We were focused on standard based planning and implementing that school wide. Teacher utilized a standards analysis approach within their planning sessions which helped enhance the instruction practice and student academic success.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will need to scaffold by building knowledge of content to support our students in engaging with grade level standards. This will be done by utilizing the learning acceleration model.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

School-wide professional development was offered during preplanning for learning acceleration across content areas. In addition, mini professional development sessions will occur through grade level collaborative planning and data analysis with curriculum content leaders and administration.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will implement and sustain collaborative planning sessions and data chats that help to address the students needs at the core as well as within small group instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1. Instructional Practice | specifically relating to Differentiation |
|--|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | We will prioritize learning acceleration to connect unfinished learning with new learning to increase overall proficiency and learning gains. |
| Measurable Outcome: | We will see a minimum of 5% learning gains across all subgroups in achievement 2021-2022 school year. |
| Monitoring: | We will utilize common assessments and analyze them in our monthly data chats. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Aliya Norman (aliya.norman@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Our evidence-based strategy is Accelerated Learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | It is an effective use of scaffolds and scaffolding strategies and a just-in-time approach to grade appropriate learning. |
| Action Steps to Implement | nt |

Train the staff on what Accelerate Learning is.

Person Responsible Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@hcps.net)

Encourage teachers to use Accelerated Learning strategies such as the ones included in the Instructional Guides through collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@hcps.net)

Train the staff on what Accelerate Learning is.

Person Responsible Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@hcps.net)

Encourage teachers to use Accelerated Learning strategies such as the ones included in the Instructional Guides through collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@hcps.net)

| #2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | We will focus on creating and implementing school-wide behavior expectations to enhance our student and staff cultures. | | | | | |
| Measurable Outcome: | We want to reduce the number of referrals and student behavior trackers for the 2021-2022 school year. | | | | | |
| Monitoring: | Within our MTSS data chats, we will discuss the progress of student behavior. We will also be implementing our school-wide P.I.R.A.T.E. rubric. | | | | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Aliya Norman (aliya.norman@hcps.net) | | | | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | We are implementing a school-wide positive intervention support. | | | | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | The broad purpose of PBIS is to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and equity of schools and other agencies. PBIS improves social, emotional, and academic outcomes for all students including students with disabilities and students from under represented groups. | | | | | |
| Action Steps to | o Implement | | | | | |
| The mission and | d vision statement were remodeled to represent the current expectations of the 2021-2022 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

2 school year. In addition, we established the core values and clear expectations for all students and staff.

Person Aliya Norman (aliya.norman@hcps.net) Responsible

We will continue to build the structures to support a strong PBIS foundation.

Person Aliya Norman (aliya.norman@hcps.net) Responsible

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We will focus on creating and implementing school-wide behavior expectations to enhance our student and staff cultures. Upon viewing the report, we see that Rampello is ranked very high impact for violent and school property incidents. As we progress throughout the year, implementing our school-wide intervention behavior support, we will continue to monitor the updated data and make adjustments as needed.

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.

We will focus on creating and implementing school- wide behavior expectations to enhance our student and staff cultures. We are focusing on the school's core P.I.R.A.T.E. values and high expectations.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our faculty, PBIS team, ILT team, Administration, SAC Committee, PTSA, students, community members, and parent volunteers.

Our role as leaders will be to teach and model the P.I.R.A.T.E. way (perseverance, innovative, responsibility, accountability, trustworthy and empathetic). We will use positive praise when students are modeling appropriate behaviors.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
|----------|--|--------|
| 2 III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| | Total: | \$0.00 |