Hillsborough County Public Schools

Liberty Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Liberty Middle School

17400 COMMERCE PARK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Frank Diaz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2010

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: A (67%)
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 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.

Table of Contents

Liberty Middle School

17400 COMMERCE PARK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

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	No	60%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

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 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.

Liberty Middle School's mission is to provide a safe, caring, yet Motivating, learning environment. The faculty and staff are dedicated to the task of assisting students with achieving Academic excellence through Rigorous and challenging learning curriculum. Through these means we will ensure that students are College-ready and have the necessary skills to be successful citizens, ultimately reaching their Highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

M.A.R.C.H. with P.R.I.D.E
(Mission) with Perseverence, Respect, Integrity, Dependability, Encouragement

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
Ammirati, James	Principal	
Brown, Angela M	Assistant Principal	
Pursley, Michael	Assistant Principal	

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	58	51	0	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	6	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	28	15	0	0	0	0	133
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	75	37	22	0	0	0	0	134

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	146	86	97	0	0	0	0	329
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	43	37	0	0	0	0	179

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
60

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/24/2019

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	37	46	49	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	45	60	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	39	57	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	93	88	0	0	0	0	296

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	23	65	71	0	0	0	0	159

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	37	46	49	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	45	60	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	39	57	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	93	88	0	0	0	0	296

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	36	53	72	0	0	0	0	161

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	61%	51%	54%	58%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	52%	54%	57%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	47%	42%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	67%	55%	58%	68%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	67%	57%	57%	71%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	58%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	62%	47%	51%	58%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	67%	72%	74%	66%	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	67 (37)	58 (46)	51 (49)	176 (132)
One or more suspensions	10 (8)	18 (45)	6 (60)	34 (113)
Course failure in ELA or Math	90 (5)	28 (39)	15 (57)	133 (101)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (115)	0 (93)	0 (88)	0 (296)

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	55%	53%	2%	54%	1%
	2018	54%	52%	2%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	54%	4%	52%	6%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	51%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	60%	53%	7%	56%	4%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	49%	6%	55%	0%
	2018	53%	48%	5%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	69%	62%	7%	54%	15%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	23%	31%	-8%	46%	-23%
	2018	37%	29%	8%	45%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	58%	47%	11%	48%	10%
	2018	57%	48%	9%	50%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	68%	67%	1%	71%	-3%
2018	67%	65%	2%	71%	-4%
Compare		1%			
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	91%	63%	28%	61%	30%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	87%	63%	24%	62%	25%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	24	41	42	34	47	39	24	38			
ELL	24	44	33	40	59	52	20	34	92		
ASN	82	73	58	90	77		97	86	97		
BLK	46	53	51	51	63	56	47	59	84		
HSP	47	51	40	55	60	50	45	59	87		
MUL	66	68	42	72	69	60	65	83	81		
WHT	76	66	44	80	72	53	77	88	84		
FRL	46	52	45	52	59	50	47	60	82		
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	28	38	33	34	54	47	26	50			
ELL	23	43	40	38	63	63	24	31	67		
ASN	84	76	40	89	86	80	93	89	100		
BLK	45	53	48	53	69	68	44	68	76		
HSP	49	53	39	52	62	59	55	57	80		
MUL	65	51		63	72	69	73	78	82		
WHT	74	62	51	83	70	52	67	81	87		
FRL	47	52	42	54	63	63	45	62	75		
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	16	36	31	26	53	52	18	29			
ELL	22	41	38	38	59	51	12	42	75		
ASN	86	82	64	91	91		84	92	97		
BLK	38	43	39	51	64	56	36	65	72		
HSP	50	55	38	62	66	57	52	67	85		
MUL	66	59		67	77		62	75	91		
WHT	70	61	50	79	73	54	74	81	88		

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
FRL	41	47	39	54	65	59	40	64	74		

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	63
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	627
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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
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	83
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	55
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	54
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	67
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	71
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.

Students in our Lowest 25 Percentile group for ELA have decreased overall as indicated by school grade.

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

Students in our Lowest 25 Percentile group for math shows the greatest decline from the prior 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.

Our Geometry ECO students show a positive gap of +43% compared to the state average.
Factors that attribute to this has been:
-Accelerated program beginning in 6th grade.
-Students are blocked together and have the same teacher for Algebra and Geometry.

Whereas, our 8th grade math students show a negative -23% gap in comparison to the state average.
Factors that attribute to this has been:
- All level 3 and above students are automatically placed in Algebra. This is not the same in all schools across the state.

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

ELA have increased in Learning Gains by 2% from the previous year.
Factors that attribute to this has been:
-Implementing standard-base planning school-wide through PLCs with content area groups.

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

1) Making gains for Math Lowest 25th Percentile students.

2) Supporting Math and ELA classes to increase student achievement levels.

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

1. Increasing students who are levels 3+ for 8th Math
2. Increasing gains for 8th grade Math Lowest 25th Percentile students
3. Increasing gains in 6th Grade ELA Lowest 25th Percentile students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Delivering Explicit Instruction
Rationale	We will plan and deliver explicit instruction utilizing a series of supports or scaffolds, where our students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill, clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target, and supported practice with feedback.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of this year, our school grade calculations will increase by 3% in overall achievement points for all contents measured (ELA, Math, Science, Civics, and Middle School Acceleration).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Ammirati (james.ammirati@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Explicit Instruction - Direct Instruction - Reciprocal Teaching - Feedback - Student Self-Verbalization - Formative Assessment
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As educators, we have to try to maximize our already limited instructional time.The effectiveness of explicit instruction has been validated repeatedly by research involving general education and special education students. According to the 'Barometer of Influence', explicit instruction has an effect of size of 0.57 in knowledge activated (Meta-Analysis, Hattie, 2009).
Action Step	
Description	1. Planning unit/standard by unpacking standards, setting learning targets, creating an assessment to measure 2. Daily explicit instruction 3. Administer formative assessments 4. Review formative assessment data 5. Plan next steps: -Instructional Support -Small group pull outs for students -PD opportunities offering instructional strategies
Person Responsible	Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

#2	
Title	Student Engagment
Rationale	At Liberty, teachers will increase opportunities for active student response by including a variety of methods within their classroom structure. Opportunities to respond increases student engagement, allows for more positive, specific feedback and decreases inappropriate behavior.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of this year, our school grade calculations will increase by 3% in overall achievement points for all contents measured (ELA, Math, Science, Civics, and Middle School Acceleration).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Ammirati (james.ammirati@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	- Reciprocal Teaching - Feedback - Student Self-Verbalization
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Reciprocal teaching refers to an instructional activity in which students become the teacher in small group reading sessions. Teachers model, then help students learn to guide group discussions using four strategies: summarizing, question generating, clarifying, and predicting. Reciprocal teaching is a reading technique which is thought to promote students' reading comprehension. This strategy also leads students to deepening their processing levels, such as self-questioning, self-instructing, and rigorous thinking. This opportunity can lead teachers to construct instant feedback for clarity on concepts discussed.

Action Step	
Description	1. Planning unit/standard by unpacking standards, setting learning targets, creating an assessment to measure 2. Daily explicit instruction 3. Plan engagement activities to allow student's processing time 4. Provide feedback based on discussions
Person Responsible	Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

#3	
Title	Instructional Support- Students with Disabilities
Rationale	The subgroup, Students With Disabilities, has scored below the proficiency level of 41%. According to the Federal Index, the SWD at Liberty MS is at a score of 34%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The supgroup, SWD, at Liberty MS will increase proficiency by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Ammirati (james.ammirati@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Instructional Supports: 1. ESE teachers will work alongside Gen Ed teachers, to modify curriculum specifically to students needs. 2. Small group pull-out sessions will be planned to reteach concepts assessed in mini assessments. 3. Case managers will update and apply changes to IEPs to ensure the most accurate support systems for success. 4. Common planning time for Gen. Ed teachers and Co-Teachers 5. Professional Development opportunities will be provided for Gen. Ed teachers to learn strategies to use in classes for modifications.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Best practices shows that ESE teachers and General Ed teachers should plan lessons with specific modifications as needed with the best interest of the SWD in mind. Teachers also need an opportunity to learn current and innovative strategies that works for SWD.

Action Step	
Description	1. Update IEPs for SWD 2. Inform teachers of SWD on their rosters and which case manager is assigned. 3. Common planning for ESE teachers and Gen. Ed teachers to plan lessons with modifications. 4. Provide a LRE space for small group sessions for reteaching concepts. 5. Provide PD opportunities to meet the needs of Gen Ed teachers for strategies that works best for SWD.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

Providing in-house Professional Development opportunities for teachers as needed based upon formative assessment data.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Delivering Explicit Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Engagment	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Support- Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00