

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Roosevelt Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Roosevelt Elementary School

3205 S FERDINAND AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christina Dickens

Start Date for this Principal: 5/10/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	10%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

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.

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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dickens, Christina	Principal	Over sees the overall functions of the school and learning community.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	131	121	129	147	107	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	757
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	86%	52%	57%	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%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	131 (0)	121 (0)	129 (0)	147 (0)	107 (0)	122 (0)	757 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (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 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	52%	36%	58%	30%
	2018	83%	53%	30%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	55%	29%	58%	26%
	2018	91%	55%	36%	56%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	87%	54%	33%	56%	31%
	2018	83%	51%	32%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	85%	51%	34%	53%	32%
	2018	79%	52%	27%	55%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	600
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	70
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	81
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	65
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Lowest quartile students need to be monitored and show increased achievement through differentiated instruction.

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

Language Arts. Teachers are learning to plan using standards, however, the resources are getting improved to match (by district).

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

N/A

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

Math-after implementing the standards based planning, the teachers worked hard as the math series was in a gap year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

ESE and lowest quartile students.

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

1. Planning with Standards
2. Using Assessment for Planning
3. Using Assessment for teaching and reteaching
4. Matching teaching activities to Standards
5. Matching teaching activities to differentiated teaching of standards

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards based planning in all subjects
Rationale	Analysis of the standards will support targeted instruction. Therefore, the analysis data will increase the achievement of all students through planing, assessment and activities focused on standards.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA and iReady data will increase for all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christina Dickens (christina.dickens@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	PLC teams will better analyze data and target instruction based on standards. The grade level teams will learn to better understand the standards and the expectations of each through team planning and analysis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If data is analyzed, it will give teachers some solid information to add to their classroom observations. The information will be used to plan lessons and learning activities.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School wide data shared in August from the 2018-2019 School Year 2. Dates set on the calendar for communication from administration to PLC Leads and other staff. 3. Each month, grade level teams will meet to look at the growth of all students and bottom quartile 4. The bottom quartile will receive interventions during intervention time. 5. Reading Coach will monitor and meet with teachers to share focused activities
Person Responsible	Christina Dickens (christina.dickens@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Teacher walk throughs will be used to give feedback and support to improve the achievement of all students.