

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Rampello K 8 Magnet School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rampello K 8 Magnet School

802 E WASHINGTON ST, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	43%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Youmans, Justin	Principal	Develops, leads, evaluates, and facilitates data-based decision-making, ensures that the MTSS Team implements, documents, and communicates with staff and parents regarding school-based plans and activities. Assists in developing the master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Responsible for overall school functioning.
Faragure, Gabrielle	Other	Oversee SAC School Improvement Plan as SAC Chair, Conduct SAC monthly meetings. Supports students and staff to provide services and expertise on issues ranging from interventions with groups of students to individual students with academic and behavioral needs.
Saddler, Jeanine	Assistant Principal	Responsible for progress monitoring through data collection, data analysis, professional development and intervention approaches. Helps to develop master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions within the classroom. Assists SAC Chair with monitoring and implementing SIP.
Hanks, Heather	Assistant Principal	Responsible for progress monitoring through data collection, data analysis, professional development and intervention approaches. Helps to develop master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions within the classroom.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/9/2020, Justin Youmans

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

740

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/27/2022

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	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	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
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	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
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		

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	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	51%	55%				71%	57%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						66%	56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						51%	52%	54%
Math Achievement	69%	41%	42%				77%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	74%						77%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						64%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	52%	48%	54%				56%	50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	57%	59%				81%	77%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2022					
	2019	69%	53%	16%	54%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
07	2022					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	53%	19%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	83%	57%	26%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
06	2022					
	2019	69%	49%	20%	55%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
07	2022					
	2019	79%	62%	17%	54%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2022					
	2019	66%	31%	35%	46%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	59%	47%	12%	48%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	67%	14%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29	53	43	33	60	55	47				
ELL	59	73	60	66	84		36				
BLK	47	57	51	54	71	77	38	48			
HSP	67	63	48	73	76	62	53	82	100		
MUL	52	65	50	67	56						
WHT	74	61	21	83	80	79	66	95	96		
FRL	46	57	49	56	73	70	34	53	94		
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 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	42	35	35	64	60	25	36			
ELL	54	65	55	71	83	82	10				
BLK	52	51	44	63	69	60	37	76	94		
HSP	78	76	65	83	82	68	55	65	100		
MUL	86	68		86	82						

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
WHT	84	74	50	89	82	73	79	100	100		
FRL	59	56	48	69	73	65	41	67	100		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
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	601
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	63
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
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	58
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	73
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	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

In ELA from 2021-2022-- we increased percent proficient in grades 3, 4, 6, & 7, with grades 3 and 4 increasing by 5 points. Grades 5 & 8 showed a decrease in percent proficient, with grade 8, showing a 12 point decrease. We met our target goal of a 5% increase for ELA learning gains by earning 70%. We missed our ELA target goal of 63% learning gains for the lowest 25% with 60%. In Math from 2021-2022—there was an increase in percent proficient in all grades 3-8. We exceeded our target goal of 5% by increasing our math achievement from 59% proficient to 69% proficient. We showed a huge increase in learning gains for the lowest 25% by going from 47% to 74%. In Science from 2021-2022, we did not meet our overall proficiency goal of 63%. Our overall achievement in science went from 58% to 52%. In 2022, 5th grade stayed the same at 58% proficient and 8th grade decreased from 59% to 48%. A trend that emerged is our BQ student learning gains are consistently lower. Our students with disabilities are also an area of opportunity in both ELA and Math achievement. Science is an area of opportunity for all subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

- 1) ELA in grades 5th and 8th showed a decrease in percent proficient with 8th grade being the largest with a 12 point decrease.
- 2) Science in 5th and 8th grade showed the largest decrease in percent proficient with 5th grade staying the same and 8th grade decreased from 59% to 48%.
- 3) Lowest 25% learning gains in ELA went from 42% in 2021, to 45% in 2022. The goal is to continue increasing percentage of lowest 25% students making learning gains.

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

As it relates to decrease in ELA, a greater emphasis was placed on Math performance the previous year. Disruption to learning still occurred throughout the school year due to Covid. This was very challenging to students receiving consistent instruction. We also faced challenges of learning gaps caused by Covid.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We had the greatest gains in our Math achievement, learning gains and bottom quartile.

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

We focused on accelerating all students in math. Teachers had standard based planning school wide. Teachers 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?

(ELA)

- Standards-based instruction (quality lesson plans)
- Opportunities for students to use higher level thinking and problem solving skills
- MTSS (progress monitor interventions regularly)
- Small group instruction
- Schoolwide focus to build writing skills
- Grades 3-5 Accessing Complex Texts
- Phonics based instruction/intervention K-3

(MATH)

- Before/After school tutoring-ELP
- Fluency practice
- Standards-based instruction (quality lesson plans)
- MTSS (progress monitor interventions regularly)
- Small group instruction
- Standards-based instruction (quality lesson plans)

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.

- Scaffolding Learning through Language for our ELL students
 - Differentiating Instruction: Responding to All Learners
 - Monthly Pirate Walks with differentiated PD offered for reading, math and science
- In addition, mini professional development sessions will occur through grade level collaborative planning and data analysis with curriculum content leaders/teams 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.

After School Academic Program (ELP)

Differentiated Instruction

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

From 2021 & 2022 ELA in grades 5 and 8 showed a decrease in percent proficient. Grade 5 (65% to 62%, -3), Grade 8 (68% to 56%, -12). As for learning gains for the Lowest 25% (Target goal of 47% to 45%, -2).

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the year 2023, there will be an increase of at least 5 percentage points from 62% to 67% for Grade 5 and an increase of at least 5 percentage points from 56% to 61% for Grade 8. By the year 2023, there will be an overall increase of at least 5 percentage points from 45% to 50% for the Lowest 25% population making learning gains.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- Monitor iReady assessments as well as weekly lessons pass rates for iReady
- Review classroom performance data for areas in need of growth.
- Standards Mastery
- Monthly MTSS Data Chats w/Teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

- Grade Conferencing w/students
- Goal setting w/students
- VE Teacher support/small group instruction
- ELP (Teacher recommendation)
- No Opt Out offered weekly to 6-8 students (teacher recommendation)
- Standards-based instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

A significant number of students in the Lowest 25% are SWD and did not meet proficiency benchmarks for FSA. We used the results from FSA and other diagnostic measures to determine these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1) Use of iReady data to identify students that are not proficient
- 2) Use of IXL for fluency building across grade levels
- 3) Allocate staffing to support the afterschool ELP (Tutoring)
- 4) Teachers continue PLC/planning and monthly MTSS data chats to monitor student progress.
- 5) MTSS monthly (Intervention discussions for students of concern)

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior and Support**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We will focus on creating and implementing school-wide behavior expectations to enhance our student and staff cultures.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We want to reduce the number of referrals and student behavior trackers for the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Within our MTSS data chats, we will discuss the progress of student behavior. We will continue our school-wide P.I.R.A.T.E. rubric and implement our S.A.I.L. (CHAMPS).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanine Saddler (jeanine.saddler@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will continue to implement a school-wide positive intervention support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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 Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Continue to put systems in place to build and strengthen our school-wide PBIS.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

At Rampello, students and staff display the Pirate Way by demonstrating civility throughout the campus. The School also incorporates the use of the CHAMPS system of behavioral expectations along with our Pirate Traits as part of the Positive Behavior Support Plan that assists to increase in academic performance while clearly communicating behavioral expectations and establishing a positive school culture. The PBIS plan also includes supports that addresses individual student needs using the Multi-Tiered System of Supports and RTI process which develops targeted intervention that best support student needs both academically and/or behaviorally. Both the CHAMPS and the MTSS-RTI programs are researched and evidence-based strategies. The school's PBIS program is centered around displaying and demonstrating the Pirate Way which encourages students to be Respectful to yourself and others, take responsibility for your own actions, and give your best effort daily. These Pirate Way expectations are also tied to tickets in which students can earn to redeem at the school's store or in the classroom. CHAMPS provides an additional layer of specific behavioral expectations tied to an activity and/or area of the school such as the classroom, recess, cafeteria, etc. Teachers and staff practice and teach these expectations and the school promotes and posts messaging that is consistent throughout the campus so students can quickly reference appropriate behavior expectations anytime during the school day and in all areas. This communicates to our students how they should properly conduct themselves.

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

Principal, Assistant Principals- model expectations, provide ongoing support for teachers in the areas of instruction and student discipline, staff recognition, shared decision making.

School Counselors-Facilitates PBIS initiatives and develop behavior management plans, provide ongoing support for teachers through securing and managing services for students.

Team/Content Leaders- serve as liaison to share concerns and brainstorm possible solutions.

PTSO- Organizes schoolwide events to build a greater sense of community and family.