

Volusia County Schools

# Galaxy Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Galaxy Middle School

2400 EUSTACE AVE, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/galaxymiddle/pages/default.aspx>

## Demographics

**Principal: Eidle Velez**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Galaxy Middle School

2400 EUSTACE AVE, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/galaxymiddle/pages/default.aspx>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>75%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>59%</p>

## School Grades History

	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Year</b>				
<b>Grade</b>	B	C	B	C

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

Through the efforts of students, staff, parents, and community, Galaxy Middle School will work toward the overall success of every individual student.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Galaxy Middle School will work toward ensuring each student receive a superior 21st century education.

### 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
Goodin, Tony	Assistant Principal	
Chenoweth, Karen	Principal	
Pough, Sherry	Assistant Principal	
Stemberger LaRuss, Rosemary	Assistant Principal	
Bynum, Jackie	Dean	
Barringer, Ashley	School Counselor	
Krob, April	Teacher, K-12	
McClarty, Kellie	Instructional Coach	
Derochers, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	
DeRosier, Christopher	Instructional Media	
Coll, Timothy	Teacher, K-12	
McCrary, Kristin	Instructional Coach	
Hirth, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	
Nehrig, Christina	Instructional Coach	
Howard, Benjamin	Teacher, K-12	
Hill, Jeanne	SAC Member	
Goodwin, Catherine	Teacher, ESE	
Velez, Lisbeth	Teacher, Adult	
Whited, Brandon	Teacher, K-12	

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	30	20	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	53	46	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	118	111	0	0	0	0	349

**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	34	55	31	0	0	0	0	120

**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	22	31	26	0	0	0	0	79
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	10

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

70

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/31/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**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	40	44	36	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	104	70	0	0	0	0	216
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	56	42	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	88	71	0	0	0	0	275

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	53	88	71	0	0	0	0	212

## 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	48%	51%	54%	50%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	51%	54%	54%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	42%	47%	43%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	53%	54%	58%	52%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	56%	51%	57%	50%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	42%	51%	45%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	60%	58%	51%	52%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	71%	72%	73%	71%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 ( )	30 ( )	20 ( )	60 (0)
One or more suspensions	3 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	10 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	30 (0)	53 (0)	46 (0)	129 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	120 (0)	118 (0)	111 (0)	349 (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
06	2019	43%	50%	-7%	54%	-11%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	47%	2%	52%	-3%
	2018	43%	47%	-4%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	46%	50%	-4%	56%	-10%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	53%	48%	5%	55%	-2%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	47%	-5%	54%	-12%
	2018	34%	44%	-10%	54%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	21%	29%	-8%	46%	-25%
	2018	28%	37%	-9%	45%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	56%	57%	-1%	48%	8%
	2018	62%	60%	2%	50%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	68%	6%	71%	3%
2018	65%	66%	-1%	71%	-6%
Compare		9%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	54%	28%	61%	21%
2018	83%	57%	26%	62%	21%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	55%	35%	57%	33%
2018	84%	55%	29%	56%	28%
Compare		6%			

**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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	10	39	40	13	35	36	16	34			
ELL	25	43	39	35	46	41	36	45	83		
ASN	82	64		100	80						
BLK	37	45	38	36	50	40	41	74	67		
HSP	43	47	42	46	52	40	53	73	72		
MUL	35	43		53	57		80	85	85		
WHT	56	55	43	62	61	45	69	78	76		
FRL	44	50	41	47	54	42	54	72	70		
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	10	29	32	7	28	28	20	26			
ELL	11	27	28	19	30	32	17	33			
ASN	90	70		100	70						
BLK	44	44	33	39	40	30	54	62	55		
HSP	42	45	37	39	40	33	56	59	60		

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
MUL	39	42		67	59			91			
WHT	56	52	38	56	48	33	75	76	66		
FRL	44	45	34	43	41	32	62	64	58		
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	14	40	38	17	37	34	13	40			
ELL	16	47	46	20	38	40	14	26			
ASN	93	77		100	85						
BLK	41	53	50	36	44	38	42	67	68		
HSP	44	53	42	46	49	43	39	67	75		
MUL	50	56		57	49		56				
WHT	58	54	41	60	52	51	68	80	69		
FRL	46	52	46	48	49	45	43	71	69		

### 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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	82
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	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	63
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 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	61
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.

Science scores showed a decline of 5%. One factor that could have contributed to this decrease is having a few new science teachers. ELA showed a decline of 1%. One factor that could have contributed to this decrease was staffing issues in Language Arts. ELA LG 25%=42%; MA LG 25%=42%

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

The greatest decline occurred in ELP with a 17% decline. This is partially due to the transient nature of the student population. WIDA scores declined. FSA increased. Science dropped 5%.

#### 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.

Math Lowest Quartile had the greatest discrepancy with a 9% gap. One factor that could contribute to this is that the classrooms that had a majority of the lowest quartile had classroom management issues. There was a lack of student engagement and checks for understanding. Collaborative structures were not in place.

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

The greatest improvement occurred in Math Learning Gains with a 12% increase and Middle School Acceleration with 12%. This is partially due to math parallel classes, intensive focus on PLCs, a full time math coach, and a Title 1 intervention.

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

A primary area of concern from EWS is the Level 1's in Math and ELA.

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

1. Standards Based Instruction
2. Student Engagement
3. Intervention and Remediation Plan
4. Social Emotional Learning

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1

**Title** ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities

**Rationale** Based on the Needs Assessment and Analysis, Student with Disabilities scored a 10% in ELA Achievement, 39% in ELA Learning Gains, 40% in ELA Learning Gains. SWD Math Achievement is 13%, Math Learning Gains is 35%, and Learning Gains of Lowest Quartile is 36%. Science Achievement is 16%, Social studies is 4%. Overall ESSA subgroup was 28%.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** Students with Disabilities will increase by 5 percentage points in core subject areas.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Intervention Strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** According to Hattie's research, Intervention has an effect size of .77.

#### Action Step

**Description**

1. Content PLCs will monitor achievement of SWD students
2. Administrators assigned to content areas to provide assistance
3. Accommodations are provided to teachers for ESE, 504, and ELL students. Teachers are aware of who they can contact for additional support such as IEP facilitator and ELL teachers.
4. Professional Learning: Students with Autism, Accommodations, Data Analysis Days, Learning Walks
5. Title 1 will provide funding for substitute teachers for Data Analysis Days, Learning Walks, ESE meetings

**Person Responsible** Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest Quartile in Reading
<b>Rationale</b>	ELA LQ increase 6% but still below state average at 42%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase lower quartile from 42 points to 47 points.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Intervention.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	According to John Hattie's research, intervention has an effect size of .77.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Literacy Coach will lead PLC and guide standards aligned instruction and develop Learning Walks</li> <li>2. PLCs will participate in data analysis of assessments to monitor achievement of Lowest Quartile</li> <li>3. Data Analysis Days will be used to create interventions and remediation plans for Lowest Quartile</li> <li>4. Title 1 Intervention teacher will pull students out of electives 2 days per week and provide additional support to students in Lowest Quartile</li> <li>5. Title 1 Tutoring Program before school will take place 2 days per week for 1 hour per session</li> <li>6. Students scoring at a 1 or 2 will be placed in a prescriptive reading program</li> <li>7. Admin will monitor these strategies by attending PLCs, Data Days, and teacher observations.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest Quartile in Math
<b>Rationale</b>	Math LQ at 42%. SWD was 13% overall achievement.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase Lowest Quartile in Math from 42 points to 47 points.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Intervention.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	According to John Hattie's research, intervention has an effect size of .77.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Math coach will lead PLC and guide standards aligned instruction and develop Learning Walks.</li> <li>2. PLCs will participate in data analysis of assessments to monitor achievement of Lowest Quartile.</li> <li>3. Data analysis days will be used to creative interventions and remediation plans for Lowest Quartile.</li> <li>4. Title 1 Intervention teacher will pull students out of electives 2 days per week and provide additional support to students in Lowest Quartile.</li> <li>5. Title 1 Tutoring program is held before school and takes place 2 days per week for 2 hour per session</li> <li>6. Admin will monitor these steps by attending PLCs, Data Days, and teacher observations.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.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).**