

Hernando County School District

Powell Middle School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	10

Powell Middle School

4100 BARCLAY AVE, Brooksville, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pms>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	B	B	C*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

To share the responsibility of preparing our students to become productive citizens through a caring environment with a commitment to excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To do our best, to be the best, while dedicating ourselves to provide the best.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Buse, Jessica	Teacher, K-12
Rufa, Laura	Teacher, K-12
Maner, Josandra	Assistant Principal
Dye, Tom	Principal
Carlson, Ed	Teacher, K-12
Duncan, Paul	Teacher, K-12
Dumas, Maria	Teacher, K-12
Edgecomb, Sarah	School Counselor
Pointer, Leslie	Teacher, K-12
Franz, Sean	Teacher, ESE
Lomaglio, Lisa	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The administrative team's role facilitating PLC and SBLT meetings that involve shared decision making regarding instructional practices, MTSS, safety, and daily operational procedures. The assessment teacher's role is providing and analyzing data to help make informed instructional decisions, coordinates progress monitoring and state testing, and manages all platforms for testing and monitoring. The teacher leader roles are conducting PLC meetings, scheduling parent/teacher conferences, and compiling reflective data analysis information to identify and address grade level, content area, and school-wide issues pertaining to overall student achievement. The guidance counselor's role is to provide information and support to teachers and administration regarding students with attendance, 504, MTSS, and scheduling needs and concerns.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	76	96	117	0	0	0	0	289
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	74	82	0	0	0	0	239
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	22	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	78	90	0	0	0	0	273

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	64	60	0	0	0	0	182

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	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	5
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected

Monday 8/27/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	49	81	71	0	0	0	0	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	47	54	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	37	18	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	126	111	0	0	0	0	348
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	124	166	0	0	0	0	421

Year 2016-17 - 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	49	81	71	0	0	0	0	201	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	47	54	0	0	0	0	140	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	37	18	0	0	0	0	71	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	126	111	0	0	0	0	348	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	124	166	0	0	0	0	421	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA lowest 25th percentile. Yes

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

8th grade math

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA learning gains

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math lowest 25th percentile. No

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Focusing on the lowest 25th percentile was our previous year's school improvement goal. Each teacher identified and focused on their lowest 25th percentile of students using pre and post tests with remediation and differentiation on skill deficits.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	57%	53%	49%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	54%	54%	50%	53%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	49%	47%	56%	50%	45%
Math Achievement	60%	65%	58%	53%	60%	55%
Math Learning Gains	66%	62%	57%	59%	60%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	61%	51%	54%	54%	47%
Science Achievement	57%	59%	52%	52%	51%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	75%	72%	82%	73%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	76 (49)	96 (81)	117 (71)	289 (201)
One or more suspensions	83 (39)	74 (47)	82 (54)	239 (140)
Course failure in ELA or Math	15 (16)	21 (37)	22 (18)	58 (71)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	105 (111)	78 (126)	90 (111)	273 (348)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	50%	53%	-3%	52%	-2%
	2017	48%	52%	-4%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	50%	51%	-1%	51%	-1%
	2017	53%	51%	2%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2018	54%	54%	0%	58%	-4%
	2017	51%	49%	2%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	51%	53%	-2%	52%	-1%
	2017	42%	53%	-11%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	58%	63%	-5%	54%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	54%	61%	-7%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2018	49%	53%	-4%	45%	4%
	2017	59%	53%	6%	46%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	56%	56%	0%	50%	6%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	76%	74%	2%	71%	5%
2017	82%	76%	6%	69%	13%
Compare		-6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
2017	95%	59%	36%	60%	35%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	45%	55%	56%	44%
2017					

Subgroup Data

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	15	33	32	28	65	67	27	58			
ELL	22	47	43	41	62	52		70			
ASN	64	57		72	70						
BLK	38	47	38	44	54	48	28	54	70		
HSP	48	50	47	53	66	67	44	75	54		
MUL	57	52	33	54	61	42	61	63	63		
WHT	54	49	46	64	67	70	65	81	66		
FRL	45	47	43	52	62	63	48	73	54		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	18	42	33	18	41	41	19	62			
ELL	24	56	46	32	64	48	30				
ASN	50	59		64	64						
BLK	29	47	50	38	59	62	23	86	25		
HSP	44	58	50	49	55	44	44	75	39		
MUL	53	44		59	51		67	76			
WHT	57	58	48	61	62	56	56	84	42		
FRL	47	55	46	52	58	50	48	77	42		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA and math
Rationale	For consecutive years, ELA bottom quartile gains have decreased. Fidelity by the math department in implementing the LQ plan to the lowest quartile of students in math showed significant improvement in this area. Because of this success, the intent is for ELA, with their supporting departments, to implement the LQ plan with an equal amount of fidelity, and for math to continue documentation and monitoring of LQ students, which will lead to increased LQ gains in both content areas.

Intended Outcome ELA LQ learning gains will increase by 5% and math LQ learning gains will increase 1%.

Point Person Laura Rufa (rufa_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description Teachers will Identify the lowest 25th percentile (all departments focus on ELA data except math) and implement the school-wide LQ plan by department . Department plans include implementation of a common, standards-based formative assessment and sharing of results and trends bi-weekly during PLC. Results are then documented and monitored on a department created and maintained shared google doc containing pretest scores, trends, and reteaching strategies. Post test scores are added to evaluate success of differentiated instruction and to identify the need for further instructional support for LQ students.

Person Responsible Josandra Maner (maner_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Lowest 25th percentile student pre and post common formative assessment data is recorded and monitored in google docs. Information is obtained using the SWAP during weekly department PLC meetings. In these meetings, each teacher presents LQ assessment data results, trends, and next steps to department and facilitating administrator.

Person Responsible Josandra Maner (maner_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$0.00