

Pasco County Schools

Centennial Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Centennial Middle School

38505 CENTENNIAL RD, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://cenms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Rick Saylor R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
2018-19 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	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Pasco 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Centennial Middle School

38505 CENTENNIAL RD, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://cenms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

Centennial Middle School creates a STEM/LATIC culture of excellence; a safe and friendly school with a challenging curriculum where all students receive a world-class education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Centennial Middle School provides a world-class STEM/LATIC education for all students.

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
Saylor, Rick	Principal	
Riba, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Switzer, Jessi	Teacher, K-12	
Salyer, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	
Morris, Sharon	Assistant Principal	
Vance, Madonna	Psychologist	
Huckabee, Carlene	Teacher, K-12	
Wolff, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Roberts, Kristin	School Counselor	
Carroll, Scotty	Instructional Coach	
Garrett, Steven	Instructional Coach	

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	235	212	273	0	0	0	0	720	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	16	40	0	0	0	0	96	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	65	0	0	0	0	119	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	34	95	0	0	0	0	150	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	73	131	0	0	0	0	298	

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	43	42	103	0	0	0	0	188

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

46

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

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	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 or Math	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	

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	

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	42%	52%	54%	41%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	55%	54%	46%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	47%	47%	32%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	46%	60%	58%	42%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	50%	61%	57%	51%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	51%	42%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	52%	51%	36%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	68%	72%	61%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	235 (0)	212 (0)	273 (0)	720 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	40 ()	16 ()	40 ()	96 (0)
One or more suspensions	20 ()	34 ()	65 ()	119 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	21 ()	34 ()	95 ()	150 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	94 ()	73 ()	131 ()	298 (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	45%	56%	-11%	54%	-9%
	2018	32%	51%	-19%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	35%	51%	-16%	52%	-17%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	49%	58%	-9%	56%	-7%
	2018	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	19%	42%	-23%	54%	-35%
	2018	22%	44%	-22%	54%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
08	2019	54%	68%	-14%	46%	8%
	2018	49%	63%	-14%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	44%	54%	-10%	48%	-4%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	50%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	55%	70%	-15%	71%	-16%
2018	61%	71%	-10%	71%	-10%
Compare		-6%			

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	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%
2018	100%	63%	37%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	13	39	40	19	38	35	19	27			
ELL	8	38	40	19	35	37		24			
BLK	20	36	38	24	33	38		24			
HSP	37	50	41	39	47	44	42	49	56		
MUL	48	58		52	46						
WHT	48	55	41	53	55	44	49	66	56		
FRL	35	47	39	39	45	41	37	49	53		
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	8	26	28	15	41	41	15	41			
ELL	17	32	29	18	38	44		27			
BLK	16	37	44	27	44	35	20				
HSP	35	38	30	36	45	45	47	56	59		
MUL	27	41		32	32						
WHT	44	39	24	47	52	53	51	69	37		
FRL	32	36	29	37	47	48	41	55	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	15	37	26	16	45	41	18	32			
ELL	13	29	17	14	35						
BLK	25	45	50	26	48	41	18	47			

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
HSP	40	45	23	38	47	33	26	59	60		
MUL	22	29		35	53						
WHT	44	48	33	46	53	48	44	63	58		
FRL	35	43	30	36	46	42	28	56	41		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	51
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	52
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	45
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.

ELA proficiency. We continue to make improvements in this area (grew 3 points from last year). We have many students who are behind academically in reading and have multiple interventions in place to better assist them.

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

Our Civics proficiency decreased by 7 points. We had one brand new teacher and one teacher with only 1 year of experience in this subject area. We have made some instructional staffing changes in this year that we feel will help us to improve in proficiency for next school year.

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.

The area of civics proficiency. We had one brand new teacher and one teacher with only 1 year of experience in this subject area. We have made some instructional staffing changes in this year that we feel will help us to improve in proficiency for next school year.

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

Learning gains in ELA. We had a major focus on writing across the school which we felt helped us see this large improvement. We plan to continue it for next year and have revised our plan to have even greater growth.

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

Course failures for our 8th graders is a concern for us. We are implementing a new system through our intervention period (homeroom) where we are having students track their grades more in order to help more students to be successful.

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

1. ELA Proficiency (including learning gains and learning gains for lowest 25%)
2. Math Proficiency (including learning gains and learning gains for lowest 25%)
3. Science Proficiency
4. Civics Proficiency
5. Course Failures

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Student Achievement
Rationale	Improve FSA Scores by 10% (ELA, Math, Alg I, Civics, and Science) ii. Improve FSA Learning Gains by 10% iii. Increased infusion of STEM-based rigorous, standards-based learning activities iv. IPG Overall Results
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	1. Core Action 1: 85% 2. Core Action 2: 70% 3. Core Action 3: 55% 4. Increase all areas of FSA by 10% (including learning gains)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	STEMLATIC Instructional Delivery model
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have seen success with the STEMLATIC approach and continue to refine our instructional practices.
Action Step	
Description	1. Rigorous standards-based learning activities across all grade levels 2. STEM-infused learning activities 3. Tier II supports and interventions
Person Responsible	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Student and Staff Engagement
Rationale	More engaged staff and students lead to improved student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Gallup Survey Goals: i. Staff Engagement: 4.00% ii. Student Engagement: 4.00% iii. Student Hope: 4.25%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	i. Need to be more overt with staff input ii. Schedule more Staff recognition activities iii. Revamp our Cyclone STAR Buck program iv. Collect more staff input in areas v. More student activities (dances, field trips, pep rallies, activities) vi. Consistent use of STORM Bucks, and better STORM Store vii. Implementation of the myPBIS rewards app email
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Gallup learning
Action Step	
Description	1. Implementation of myPBIS rewards for students and staff 2. Gather additional feedback from staff 3. Increased classroom walk-throughs 4. Student leadership board 5.
Person Responsible	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Tier II & Tier III Supports
Rationale	Solid Tier II and Tier III structures in place to better support students behaviorally and academically
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	i. Using the RTI at Work framework revamp our STORM center to address Tier II ii. Revise RTI Pyramids (train staff and monitor for implementation) iii. Continue SIT work with Tier III students
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	RTI at Work (research from Solution Tree)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To create and maintain solid Tier II and III supports and interventions for students
Action Step	
Description	1. Grade level SIT meetings 2. School level SIT meetings 3. School Counselors 4. Leadership team
Person Responsible	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.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).

NA

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

We have hired a new part-time Parent involvement Assistant to help better engage parents and families. We are forming a PTSA out of our Parent Support Club to help get more involvement from our parents and families.

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.

- Incoming 6th grade Open House held in May of each year for parents to meet teachers and to learn more about the curriculum and instruction at Centennial Middle School.
- New School year Open House held the Thursday night before classes begin to help students and parents meet their teachers, follow their schedules, learn more about the school, and to feel more comfortable with the upcoming school year.
- Student Services staff has extra classroom presentations planned for incoming 6th graders at the beginning of the school year.
- Mentoring group for 6th graders whose teachers feel that need more assistance for a successful school year.

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

- The leadership team helps to look at the needs of the school and the students and to help align resources to best meet these needs.
- The leadership team meets bi-weekly, and also online through email and discussion forums as needed.

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.

SAC meetings, Student Leadership Board Meetings, School Leadership Meetings, Title I Parent meetings, and also feedback from staff and district.

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

Establishing community partnerships, more engaging Authentic Learning Units that help solve real-world problems through engaging the community.