Randall Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Randall Middle School

16510 FISHHAWK BLVD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Colin Gerding

Start Date for this Principal: 2/3/2014

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)	18%
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 (80%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (76%) 2014-15: A (85%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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

Randall Middle School

16510 FISHHAWK BLVD, Lithia, FL 33547

[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	15%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

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

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.

Randall Middle School will challenge our students to reach their highest academic potential while encouraging and supporting their social and emotional development as middle school students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Randall Middle School will be the District's leading middle school in academics and extracurricular programs.

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
Mawhinney, Claire	Principal	
Carrillo, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	465	506	508	0	0	0	0	1479
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	11	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	6	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	34	47	0	0	0	0	141

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	3	7	14	0	0	0	0	24

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
80

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/27/2019

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	24	12	45	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	39	35	0	0	0	0	111

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	4	12	16	0	0	0	0	32

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	24	12	45	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	39	35	0	0	0	0	111

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	4	12	16	0	0	0	0	32

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	83%	51%	54%	81%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	70%	52%	54%	68%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	47%	47%	57%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	89%	55%	58%	86%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	74%	57%	57%	72%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	52%	51%	69%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	81%	47%	51%	77%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	89%	67%	72%	95%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	465 (0)	506 (0)	508 (0)	1479 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (24)	21 (12)	11 (45)	43 (81)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	12 (0)	2 (13)	6 (15)	20 (28)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	60 (37)	34 (39)	47 (35)	141 (111)

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	82%	53%	29%	54%	28%
	2018	79%	52%	27%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	83%	54%	29%	52%	31%
	2018	79%	52%	27%	51%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	83%	53%	30%	56%	27%
	2018	82%	54%	28%	58%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	85%	49%	36%	55%	30%
	2018	78%	48%	30%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	91%	62%	29%	54%	37%
	2018	95%	61%	34%	54%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	51%	31%	20%	46%	5%
	2018	54%	29%	25%	45%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	81%	47%	34%	48%	33%
	2018	75%	48%	27%	50%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	67%	22%	71%	18%
2018	91%	65%	26%	71%	20%
Compare		-2%			
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	98%	63%	35%	61%	37%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	97%	63%	34%	62%	35%
Compare		1%			
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	35	52	46	54	55	53	39	60	50		
ELL	65	73	69	75	64	54					
ASN	95	82		100	94		77	100	100		
BLK	67	74	61	65	67	65		86			
HSP	82	73	70	87	72	67	81	86	90		
MUL	84	69	46	96	78	89	95	100	100		
WHT	83	69	65	90	74	72	81	89	92		
FRL	70	67	59	80	71	73	60	77	88		
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	41	58	56	55	58	55	30	63	78		
ELL	63	80	80	75	84	75					
ASN	95	85	90	98	88		100	100	100		
BLK	60	56	56	65	72	61	61	82	100		
HSP	78	68	66	82	70	64	63	91	95		
MUL	88	75	77	92	76	82	75	100	90		
WHT	80	67	54	89	73	71	77	92	94		
FRL	64	60	51	70	59	57	55	82	84		
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	34	39	35	50	57	49	41	72	87		
ELL	40	67	64	40	63						
ASN	89	82		92	92		95	100	100		
BLK	60	49	44	67	65	60	74	83	88		
HSP	80	69	60	84	73	71	73	93	95		
MUL	80	69	62	88	81	74	81	83	92		
WHT	81	67	57	87	70	69	77	97	95		

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	63	56	47	64	60	56	53	83	88		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	716
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	67
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	93
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	69
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	79
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	84
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	79
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	72
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile with an average of 65%. This is a 7% increase from the prior school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Social Studies Achievement with an average of 89%, which was a 3% decrease from the year prior. The percent at proficiency is still well above average. However, the Civics PLC is identifying strategies to meet the needs of all learners.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Achievement, which was 31% above the state average. Randall's dedicated math teachers hold lunch and learns to improve math skills for all learners.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile with an average of 65%, which was a 7% increase from the year prior. The actions that Randall has taken in this area include the addition of the Bright Fish program, lunch and learns for level one and two students, data chats, new strategies used with intensive developmental readers, and an FSA boot camp led by our literacy coach.

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

A potential area of concern, based on the EWS data, is our SWD. This area decreased in 7 out of the 9 grade components.

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

1. Differentiating Instruction using WICOR strategies
2. Behavior management in mixed ability classrooms using best practices for diverse student populations
3. Increasing student achievement in reading, writing, speaking and listening based on the Florida Standards
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Building strong culture and relationships
Rationale	KPI data indicates 60% of students stated, "My teachers help me set goals for my classes"
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	2020 KPI data will increase to 70% for the statement above.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	SEL hawk huddle Classroom level goal setting Data Chats
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our goal is to empower students to set acedmica goals for highschool and post secondary education.
Action Step	
Description	1. quarterly AVID PD 2. school wide plan for goal setting 3. Collect data using school wide poll 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@hcps.net)

#2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains in SWD in the bottom quartile
Rationale	In 2018, our student data for SWD in the bottom quartile of ELA dropped 10 points. In 2018 SWD in the bottom 25% scored 56%. In 2019 SWD in the bottom 25% scored 46%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	On the Spring 2020 ELA FSA RMS learning gains for SWD in the bottom 25% will increase by 10% or more.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	School wide AVID WICOR based lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As an AVID focused school we will be enchancing lessons by ensuring every student is practicing ELA skills through WICOR in every class on campus. We will use WICOR walk throughs to collect data to measure the effectivness and identify the areas of need for teacher PD.

Action Step	
Description	1.Data Chats 2. Data driven PLCs 3. monthly common assessments 4. WICOR walk throughs 5. Demo Classrooms 6. quarterly AVID PD focused on WICOR strategies.
Person Responsible	Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@hcps.net)

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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Building strong culture and relationships**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains in SWD in the bottom quartile**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**