Roosevelt Elementary School

2021-22 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: 7/29/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
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. 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.](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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	10%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wheatley, Denise	Principal	The principal oversees the overall function of the school and learning community.
Woods, Jodie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports the management of the school, including student activities and curriculum instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, 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.*
7

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school
769

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	119	125	121	112	131	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/1/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				86%	52%	57%	86%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	55%	58%	75%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	50%	53%	69%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				87%	54%	63%	88%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				78%	57%	62%	81%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	46%	51%	67%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				84%	50%	53%	80%	51%	55%

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 Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	88%	52%	36%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	84%	55%	29%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	87%	54%	33%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	85%	54%	31%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	87%	57%	30%	64%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2021					
	2019	86%	54%	32%	60%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	85%	51%	34%	53%	32%
Cohort Comparison						

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 used.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	71	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	46	54
	Students With Disabilities	30	50	60
	English Language Learners	25	25	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	56	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	18	31
	Students With Disabilities	40	50	50
	English Language Learners	25	25	25

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	72	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	54	54
	Students With Disabilities	14	43	57
	English Language Learners	25	25	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	56	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	31	39
	Students With Disabilities	29	43	43
	English Language Learners	25	25	25

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	88	70	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	82	46	55
	Students With Disabilities	67	22	67
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	48	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	46	55
	Students With Disabilities	56	78	78
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	50	66	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	45	45	45
	English Language Learners	100	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	62	43	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	45	50
	Students With Disabilities	18	27	45
	English Language Learners	100	100	100

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	68	51	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	21	21
	Students With Disabilities	78	56	44
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	65	48	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	14	7
	Students With Disabilities	44	44	33
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	52			83							
ELL	69			75							
ASN	100			100							
HSP	79			81							
MUL	83			83							
WHT	87	69	76	92	74	61	81				
FRL	55	31		68	46		43				
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				

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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	68
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	72
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
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	83
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	
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	77
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	49
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?

Comparing to the State Assessment from 2018-2019;
The student demonstrating learning gains in Math went from 78% to 70% -8
The students demonstrating learning gains for the bottom quartile in Math went from 64% to 54% -10
The students scoring a level 3 or above in achievement for Science went from 84% to 77% -7

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

The greatest need for improvement is in the area of Math and Science. [Math Bottom Quartile learning gains (-10%) and our Math learning gains (-8%). Science -7%].

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

During the Covid pandemic, the school offered eLearning and simultaneous learning for our students. We will need to address any unfinished learning for our students.

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

The students demonstrating learning gains for the bottom quartile students in ELA. The scores went from 63% to 73%, an increase of 10.

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

Teachers focused on the ELA standards to drive the instruction for individual students.

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

Teachers will utilize standards based assessments to drive effective differentiated instruction for all students in a timely manner in the area of Math and Science.

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.

We will provide professional development to our teachers on how to analyze the students assessment data to effectively plan and implement instruction to teach content on grade level while effectively scaffolding and supporting unfinished learning.

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

We have developed a strong Instructional Leadership Team that will continue to support our improvement. They have developed walk-throughs and look fors and will continuously review data to determine the needs of our students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math is an area of focus. Learning gains for all students need to increase. The student demonstrating learning gains in Math went from 78% to 70% -8 and the students demonstrating learning gains for the bottom quartile in Math went from 64% to 54% -10.
Measurable Outcome:	The Instructional Leadership Team will meet with grade level Math PLC teams to increase individual student Math Skills and master Math Standards.
Monitoring:	The grade level content specific PLC teams along with the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will monitor student learning gains in Math using Math Monthly Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Wheatley (denise.wheatley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of PLC and ILT to disaggregate data from the Math Monthly Assessments to determine the needs of the students and providing the students with the necessary instruction to master the standards will increase the learning gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Assessments are used to monitor the individual students growth at all times and used to create small groups for instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop an ILT (Instructional Leadership Team).
Develop a walk through form with look fors to move instruction forward
Develop learning walks for our teachers to observe, reflect and move learning forward.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The students scoring a level 3 or above in achievement for Science went from 84% to 77% -7
Measurable Outcome:	The students scoring a level 3 or above on the achievement level for Science will increase 5 percentage points.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored through the use of assessments to show growth in Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Wheatley (denise.wheatley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small groups with scaffolding to master the Science standards will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PLC teams will use student data to group students and drive instruction to increase the growth and address any unfinished learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop an ILT (Instructional Leadership Team).
Develop a walk through form with look fors to move instruction forward in Science.
Develop learning walks for our teachers to observe, reflect and move learning forward.

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

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.

Roosevelt Elementary uses Conscious Disciple for our Behavior Plan and we do not have Discipline Data that is impacting the learning.

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.

By maintaining a consistent focus on the school's instructional priorities and goals and including all faculty in the decision making process, the school culture will improve. The leadership team will set the expectations for the school and provide the teachers and staff with the professional development they need to be successful. The school wide data retrieved from classroom walkthroughs and observations, will highlight the positive and the areas needing growth. Guiding and supporting the teachers and staff will have a positive effect on the school culture.

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

The faculty, the parents, the students, and business partners all have a stake in our school. Working together to promote the students well-being and learning will improve the culture and environment of the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**