Marion County Public Schools

Howard Middle School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Howard Middle School

1655 NW 10TH ST, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

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	Yes	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Howard Middle School is committed to support all students so they can achieve their greatest academic and personal potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The faculty and staff of Howard Middle School are committed to providing our students with quality educational experiences, integrating curriculum content with real world experiences. All students are provided opportunities to achieve and reach their full potential through rigorous instruction, relevant curriculum, and relationships with staff.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Rembert, Bernard	Principal
Daubenmire, Matthew	Dean
Jones, Heather	School Counselor
Oliver, Natasha	School Counselor
Shaheed, Aisha	Dean
Greenbaum, Howard	Assistant Principal
Owen, Katy	Assistant Principal
Laplante, Allison	Other
Ponder, Angela	Instructional Coach
Manges, Diana	Other

Duties

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

Florida defines a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) as an evidence-based model of schooling that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention.
Within the MTSS, resources are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. To ensure efficient use of resources, we begin with the identification of trends and patterns using schoolwide and gradelevel
data.
The MTSS is characterized by a continuum of integrated academic and behavior supports reflecting the need for students to have fluid access to instruction and supports of varying intensity levels.
Students who need instructional intervention beyond what is administered universally are provided with targeted, supplemental interventions delivered individually or in small groups at increasing levels of intensity.

These levels, or tiers, are used to describe the intensity of the instruction and interventions provided, not categories of students. The three tiers are:

• Tier 1 is the core universal instruction and supports designed and differentiated for all students in all settings.

• Tier 2 is the targeted supplemental interventions and supports some students receive in addition to and aligned with the core academic and behavior curriculum and instruction.

• Tier 3 is the intensive individualized interventions and supports few students receive in addition to and aligned with the core academic and behavior curriculum and instruction.

The data collected at each tier are used to measure the efficacy of the supports so that meaningful decisions can be made about which instruction and interventions should be maintained and layered. More information and helpful resources can be found on Florida's MTSS website located at http://www.florida-rti.org/index.htm.

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	111	47	62	0	0	0	0	220
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	57	23	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	54	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	124	123	0	0	0	0	345

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	169	153	164	0	0	0	0	486

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	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	27	20	0	0	0	0	66

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 8/22/2018

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	52	31	46	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	79	93	0	0	0	0	230
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	39	56	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	46	0	0	0	0	88

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	182	144	178	0	0	0	0	504

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	52	31	46	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	79	93	0	0	0	0	230
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	39	56	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	46	0	0	0	0	88

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	182	144	178	0	0	0	0	504

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?

Learning Gains for the Bottom Quartile in ELA. Yes it is a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA Learning Gains

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

ELA LG for the bottom quartile

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

Math Learning Gains for the Bottom Quartile, which is not a trend.

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

The use of I-Ready data and progress monitoring by teachers led to the increase in this percentage.

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	55%	47%	53%	59%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	50%	54%	55%	46%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	45%	47%	33%	39%	45%
Math Achievement	64%	52%	58%	63%	47%	55%
Math Learning Gains	66%	61%	57%	62%	50%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	52%	51%	38%	38%	47%
Science Achievement	55%	46%	52%	55%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	66%	72%	65%	58%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	111 (52)	47 (31)	62 (46)	220 (129)
One or more suspensions	70 (58)	57 (79)	23 (93)	150 (230)
Course failure in ELA or Math	21 (11)	54 (39)	0 (56)	75 (106)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	98 (11)	124 (31)	123 (46)	345 (88)

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	51%	44%	7%	52%	-1%
	2017	57%	44%	13%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	55%	43%	12%	51%	4%
	2017	55%	42%	13%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2018	59%	49%	10%	58%	1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	57%	48%	9%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	53%	42%	11%	52%	1%
	2017	57%	37%	20%	51%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	62%	49%	13%	54%	8%
	2017	58%	47%	11%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2018	58%	43%	15%	45%	13%
	2017	49%	43%	6%	46%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	56%	46%	10%	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	70%	64%	6%	71%	-1%
2017	67%	64%	3%	69%	-2%
Compare		3%			

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	99%	57%	42%	62%	37%
2017	98%	53%	45%	60%	38%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	54%	46%	56%	44%
2017	100%	48%	52%	53%	47%
Compare		0%			

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	18	38	32	20	43	34	18	40			
ELL	11	32	33	16	43	39		30			
ASN	97	71		100	88		92	100	96		
BLK	30	40	37	44	55	43	27	51	36		
HSP	57	53	41	61	60	43	59	70	50		
MUL	67	52	30	78	71		64	78	56		
WHT	69	55	40	77	74	59	73	89	61		
FRL	41	44	37	52	60	45	40	61	43		

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	6	35	32	13	40	36	12	14			
ELL	16	25	24	26	67	50					
ASN	98	82		98	85		96	100	81		
BLK	30	39	29	37	46	35	29	45	26		
HSP	56	49	28	63	66	39	33	69	59		
MUL	70	53		74	64	45	60	85	70		
WHT	72	65	54	76	69	47	74	84	67		
FRL	38	45	33	46	53	38	35	55	43		

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	ELA instruction
Rationale	Based on 2017-2018 FSA data, HMS areas of focus will be: ELA Achievement 55%; State 53% ELA Learning Gains 50%: State 54% ELA Learning Gains Lowest (25%) - 38%; state 47% By the end of the 2018-19 school year, 60% of all Howard Middle School's identifiable sub-groups in grades 6-8 will meet or exceed reading standards as measured by the Florida State Assessment (FSA).
Intended Outcome	If teachers and administration are provided relevant professional development and coaching in literacy best practices, then student proficiency and learning gains should improve in ELA by 8% as measured by FSA. ELA Achievement from 55% to 63% ELA Learning Gains from 50% to 58% ELA Learning Gains Lowest (25%) - from 38% to 46%
Point Person	Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Professional development will be provided by a Literacy CAS to address students' needs that are determined by reviewing FSA, QSMA, iReady, Write Score and other student assessments. Focus on improving writing skills for the entire school will enhance ELA scores as evidenced by FSA. Providing students with access to more informational text, which can be used across content areas. Literacy Workshops for families to educate them on student mastery requirements. Scheduled walkthroughs to view the instruction of peers can lead to teachers gaining best practices. Professional development on formative assessments will also give teachers access to more data to map instruction. On-going data meetings and collaborative planning sessions will provide opportunities to develop action plans for students and classrooms.
Person Responsible	Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Sign-in sheets and surveys for professional development sessions. Local/State Assessments Classroom observation data of the use of formative assessments and the focus of disciplinary literacy.

Person Responsible   Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Math Instruction
Rationale	Based on 2017-2018 FSA data, HMS areas of focus will be: Math Achievement 64%; State 58% Math Learning Gains 66%; State 57% Math Learning Gains Lowest (25%) – 47%; State 51% By the end of the 2018-19 school year, 66% of all Howard Middle School's identifiable sub-groups in grades 6-8 will meet or exceed mathematics standards as measured by the Florida State Assessment (FSA).
Intended Outcome	If teachers and administration are provided relevant professional development and coaching in mathematical best practices, then student proficiency and learning gains should improve by 4% in Math as measured by FSA. Math Achievement from 64% to 68% Math Learning Gains from 66% to 70% Math Learning Gains Lowest (25%) – from 47% to 51%
Point Person	Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Professional development will be provided by a campus instructional leader to address needs that are determined by reviewing FSA, QSMA, iReady and other student assessments. The use of the iReady online instructional piece with fidelity. Providing students with access to differentiated math lessons, which can be used to address remediation and enrichment. Professional development provided by instructional leaders on campus, as well as consultants will provide teachers with best practices for instruction. On-going data meetings and collaborative planning sessions will provide opportunities to develop action plans for students and classrooms. Scheduled walkthroughs to view the instruction of peers can lead to a teachers gaining best practices. Professional development on formative assessments will also give teachers access to more data to map instruction. STEAM night will give families an opportunity to engage in science, technology, engineering, art, and music at their child's school.
Person Responsible	Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Sign-in sheets and surveys for professional development sessions. Local/State Assessments

Classroom observation data of the use of formative assessments and the focus of
disciplinary literacy.
Data chats with teachers

**Person
Responsible** Howard Greenbaum (howard.greenbaum@marion.k12.fl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts
to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every
Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I
schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other
community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Parent teacher conferences
School orientation
School open house
Parent portal sign up and help
SAC meetings
School website updated regularly
Flyers sent home with lower quartile students about how parents can help (frequently checking the
portal, utilizing the email link to contact teachers, checking their planner, enrolling their child in available
tutoring sessions)
Newsletters
21st Century Learning Communities
Family Engagement Activities

All of these avenues are used to build relationships with families to increase their involvement with and
knowledge about the school.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which
may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

HMS has a school psychologist, a behavior specialist, and 2 school counselors in order to meet our
students' emotional needs. They all attend our leadership team meetings where we discuss the needs of
students on a weekly basis. Utilizing Unify, the need gets filtered by academics, behavior, attendance,
mobility, and retention, as early warning indicators for student that needs support. HMS also has Child
Study Team meetings that include the guidance counselors, social worker, the assistant principal, the
parent, and child, in order to provide assistance to for the given student and their parent.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of
students in transition from one school level to another.**

ESE students receive articulation meetings between elementary (incoming 6th graders) and high schools
(outgoing 8th graders). Elementary schools are invited to send over incoming 6th grade students to our
school for a tour as well as scheduling information. High schools are invited to present their magnet

programs at SAC meetings. They also come over in the spring to meet with our 8th grade students and speak about scheduling.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Florida defines a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) as an evidence-based model of schooling that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. Within the MTSS, resources are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. To ensure efficient use of resources, we begin with the identification of trends and patterns using schoolwide and grade-level data.
The three tiers are:

• Tier 1 is the core universal instruction and supports designed and differentiated for all students in all settings.
• Tier 2 is the targeted supplemental interventions and supports some students receive in addition to and aligned with the core academic and behavior curriculum and instruction.
• Tier 3 is the intensive individualized interventions and supports few students receive in addition to and aligned with the core academic and behavior curriculum and instruction.
The data collected at each tier are used to measure the efficacy of the supports so that meaningful decisions can be made about which instruction and interventions should be maintained and layered. More information and helpful resources can be found on Florida's MTSS website located at http://www.florida-rti.org/index.htm.

Title I – Part C – Migrant Program:

District funds are used to purchase:

· School supplies,

· Fund a Migrant Liaison that works with schools and families to identify students and provide need referrals for families

Referrals to After School Tutorial Program to improve grades, increase promotion, improve attendance and reduce the dropout rate.

Families must meet the federal eligibility to participate in the program.

Title II – Part A: - District provides staff development activities to improve basic educational programs and to assist administrators and teachers in meeting highly qualified status.

Title III – Part A: Services are provided through the District, for education materials and ELL district support services on an as needed basis to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X: District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (Clothing, school supplies, social services referrals….) for students identified homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI):
Dropout prevention and academic intervention programs are funded through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and Supplemental Academic Instruction categorical funds. School districts have flexibility in how SAI funds may be expended as long as dollars are used to help students gain at least a year of knowledge for each year in school and to help students not be left behind.

Exceptional Student Education: The Florida Diagnostic Learning Resource System is funded through EHA-Part B as amended by PL94-142, to provide Support Services to Exceptional Student Education Programs.

Vocations Education: Proposals are submitted annually to enhance selected Vocational Programs for regular, disadvantaged and handicapped students in grades 7-12.

Health Department: District and schools coordinate with the Health Department for Absences Programs, Asthma Programs and Nurses that oversee school health clinics.

Law Enforcement-Ocala Police Department and Marion County Sheriff's Department: Bike Safety Week, DARE Program (piloting for HMS 7th graders this year), Walk your Child to School…

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

MCPS implements standards provided by the state which prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade, K-12, and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers, and life. 8th grade students will receive an opportunity to go to local college for the College and Career Expo. Students can attain certifications in trades while at Howard Middle School.

Part V: Budget	
Total:	$197,703.00