Powell Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Powell Middle School

4100 BARCLAY AVE, Brooksville, FL 34609

https://www.hernandoschools.org/pms

Demographics

Principal: Alex Rasttater

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2015

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)	84%
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: C (52%)
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 Hernando 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

Powell Middle School

4100 BARCLAY AVE, Brooksville, FL 34609

https://www.hernandoschools.org/pms

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	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

To share the responsibility of preparing our students to become productive citizens through a caring environment with a commitment to excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To do our best, to be the best, while dedicating ourselves to provide the best.

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
Rufa, Laura	Teacher, K-12	The Assessment Teacher provides and analyzes student and school data to help make informed instructional decisions. She coordinates progress monitoring and state testing, and manages all platforms for testing and monitoring.
Dye, Tom	Principal	The administrative team facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings that involve shared decision making regarding instructional practices, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), safety, and daily operational procedures. Evaluative administrator for Social Studies, PE, School Counselor, and Elective departments.
Rastatter, Alex	Assistant Principal	The administrative team facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings that involve shared decision making regarding instructional practices, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), safety, and daily operational procedures. Evaluative administrator for Math and ESE departments.
Anderson, Sherri	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Beall, George	Teacher, K-12	English Language Arts (ELA) Department Chair
Blackwell, Ron	Teacher, K-12	PE Department Chair
Carlson, Ed	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Franz, Sean	Teacher, ESE	Dean of Students/MTSS Coordinator
Duncan, Paul	Teacher, K-12	8th Grade Team Leader
Edgecomb, Sarah	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair
Fischer, Renee	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Pointer, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Team Leader
Smith, Josh	Assistant Principal	The administrative team facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings that involve shared decision making regarding instructional practices, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), safety, and daily operational procedures. Evaluative administrator for Science, ELA, and Reading departments.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vermette, Holly	Teacher, K-12	7th Grade Team Leader
Young, Serena	Teacher, K-12	Performing Arts Department Chair

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	348	374	360	0	0	0	0	1082
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	35	50	48	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	96	66	0	0	0	0	262

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	159	177	199	0	0	0	0	535

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	0	0	0	0	18

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
66

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	76	96	117	0	0	0	0	289
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	74	82	0	0	0	0	239
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	22	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	78	90	0	0	0	0	273

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	58	64	60	0	0	0	0	182

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	76	96	117	0	0	0	0	289
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	74	82	0	0	0	0	239
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	22	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	78	90	0	0	0	0	273

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	58	64	60	0	0	0	0	182

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	57%	56%	54%	52%	54%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	53%	54%	57%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	47%	47%	47%	49%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	61%	58%	57%	62%	56%
Math Learning Gains	62%	55%	57%	60%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	51%	51%	53%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	57%	56%	51%	52%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	72%	72%	82%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	348 (0)	374 (0)	360 (0)	1082 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (76)	0 (96)	0 (117)	0 (289)
One or more suspensions	35 (83)	50 (74)	48 (82)	133 (239)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (15)	6 (21)	9 (22)	16 (58)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	100 (105)	96 (78)	66 (90)	262 (273)

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	52%	52%	0%	54%	-2%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	53%	2%	52%	3%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	58%	53%	5%	56%	2%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
	2018	51%	53%	-2%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	62%	-7%	54%	1%
	2018	58%	63%	-5%	54%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	57%	50%	7%	46%	11%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
Cohort Comparison		-1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
08	2019	57%	54%	3%	48%	9%	
	2018	56%	56%	0%	50%	6%	
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	81%	75%	6%	71%	10%
2018	76%	74%	2%	71%	5%
Compare		5%			
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	80%	59%	21%	61%	19%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		-15%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	55%	39%	57%	37%
2018	100%	45%	55%	56%	44%
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	20	42	40	31	54	53	31	53			
ELL	38	60	56	48	72	79	29	67	54		
ASN	78	78		81	78		64	91	75		
BLK	51	64	48	52	56	53	29	81			
HSP	56	57	53	55	61	72	50	78	46		
MUL	62	58	60	65	76	93	67	80			
WHT	56	57	50	62	61	67	63	86	60		
FRL	53	58	52	53	61	71	50	79	52		

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	15	33	32	28	65	67	27	58			
ELL	22	47	43	41	62	52		70			
ASN	64	57		72	70						
BLK	38	47	38	44	54	48	28	54	70		
HSP	48	50	47	53	66	67	44	75	54		
MUL	57	52	33	54	61	42	61	63	63		
WHT	54	49	46	64	67	70	65	81	66		
FRL	45	47	43	52	62	63	48	73	54		

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	18	42	33	18	41	41	19	62			
ELL	24	56	46	32	64	48	30				
ASN	50	59		64	64						
BLK	29	47	50	38	59	62	23	86	25		
HSP	44	58	50	49	55	44	44	75	39		
MUL	53	44		59	51		67	76			
WHT	57	58	48	61	62	56	56	84	42		
FRL	47	55	46	52	58	50	48	77	42		

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	65
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	88
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	646

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	59
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	78
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	54
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	62
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	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	62
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	62
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 Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance for Powell Middle School. Although the percentage increased from the prior year (45% to 51%), the low performance in this category has been a trend at Powell. This seems to consistently be the lowest performing component for the district and the state as well.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the greatest decline from the prior year (66% to 62%). Powell had several students that earned a 4 or 5 in 7th grade Math, and then earned a 3 on the Algebra EOC.

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.

Although Powell outperformed the state in every category, we were only 3 percentage points higher in ELA and Math Achievement.

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

ELA Learning Gains showed the most improvement with an increase of 8 percentage points (50% to 58%). ELA/Reading teachers gained more knowledge on how to utilize i-Ready reports to drive instruction in the classroom. Common planning and increased professional development also played an important role in the increase in scores.

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

SBLT Discussion

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

1. ELA Lowest Quartile
2. Math Learning Gains
3. ESE Subgroup for ELA/Math Proficiency (ESSA flagged)
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Student Engagement
Rationale	Learning Gains for students in the Lowest Quartile increased from last year to this year (ELA 45% to 51% and Math 65% to 70%), but our Learning Gains for ELA Lowest 25% was Powell's lowest performing data component. Students With Disabilities had a Federal Index of 36%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	With an increase in student engagement, student performance data on progress monitoring assessments will increase over the course of the year. Powell will use i-Ready diagnostic results to monitor ELA and Math and will use 9 week exam results for Science and Social Studies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Lowest 25% - Teachers will utilize a bottom quartile data monitoring document to track student data and Administration will conduct data chats with students. 2. SWD - ESE teachers have been strategically placed with core classroom teachers and provided common planning with those teachers, in an attempt to focus on incorporating specific engagement strategies into core lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. John Hattie indicates that student/teacher relationships have a 0.52 effect size (anything above 0.4 is considered highly effective). Administration/teacher/student data chats will help build relationships with students and have a positive impact on student achievement. 2. Common planning between the core and ESE teachers will provide time for them to collaborate and create more engaging lessons focused on individual student needs.

Action Step	
Description	1. Administration will create a bottom quartile document through Google Docs, teachers will be trained on what information will be tracked, and administration will conduct quarterly data chats with the students. 2. Administration will meet with teachers during weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC). Teachers will focus on sorting student formative data and creating engaging lessons in response to the results. 3. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) meetings will take place to identify students needing additional supports. 4. Monthly School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings will take place to discuss progress of students in the following areas: Academics, Behavior, and Attendance. 5.
Person Responsible	Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.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).