Central Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Central Middle School

2600 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.central.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Heather Smith A

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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)	55%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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, <u>click here</u>.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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

Central Middle School

2600 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.central.brevard.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 7-8	No	51%

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	B	B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

Central Middle School will provide quality education in a culture of collaboration and learning to prepare all students to be college and career ready fostering success in a global society. (Rev Aug 2018)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Central Middle School will empower students by promoting leadership through AVID practices. (Rev Aug 2018)

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
Scheuerer, Todd	Principal	Leading the faculty and staff to maintain a safe learning environment for all.
Benjamin, Lorri	Assistant Principal	Leads the faculty and staff on implementation of curriculum, instruction, and scheduling that meets the needs of all students. AVID administrator
Higham, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Student services, discipline, and professional development
Mannes, Cole	Assistant Principal	Student services, discipline, and facilities
Zifer, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator
Sanders, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Coordinating assessments and data analysis

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	0	644	548	0	0	0	0	1192
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175	154	0	0	0	0	329
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	95	0	0	0	0	145
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	75	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	124	0	0	0	0	241

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	191	166	0	0	0	0	357

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	5	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	15

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

76

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/18/2019

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	55%	59%	54%	58%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	54%	55%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	48%	47%	43%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	66%	58%	60%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	49%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	51%	37%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	52%	51%	50%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	75%	72%	73%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	644 (0)	548 (0)	1192 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	175 ()	154 ()	329 (0)
One or more suspensions	50 (0)	95 (0)	145 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	21 (0)	75 (0)	96 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	117 (0)	124 (0)	241 (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
07	2019	50%	58%	-8%	52%	-2%
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	51%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	60%	63%	-3%	56%	4%
	2018	63%	65%	-2%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2019	57%	62%	-5%	54%	3%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	39%	43%	-4%	46%	-7%
	2018	44%	41%	3%	45%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	48%	53%	-5%	48%	0%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	72%	74%	-2%	71%	1%
2018	71%	73%	-2%	71%	0%
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%	61%	30%	61%	30%
2018	99%	62%	37%	62%	37%
Compare		-8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%
2018	100%	60%	40%	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	20	43	41	27	40	39	13	40	16		
ELL	33	47	44	44	49	38	21	57	75		
ASN	86	76		86	62		68	100	96		
BLK	34	47	47	35	42	37	23	64	56		
HSP	55	55	54	56	52	43	35	75	58		
MUL	50	51	50	55	47	35	58	66	77		
WHT	60	55	52	69	53	38	57	74	71		
FRL	45	51	47	50	45	34	34	65	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
SWD	19	39	44	28	39	36	15	40	18		
ELL	38	60	55	45	52	48	29	67	50		
ASN	81	75		78	66		69	95	93		
BLK	37	47	47	32	45	38	33	53	71		
HSP	44	53	43	51	50	46	44	57	40		
MUL	59	47	27	58	63	67	34	74	54		
WHT	61	52	49	72	62	46	63	78	66		
FRL	46	49	43	51	50	44	41	64	42		
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	33	29	16	39	41	8	33			
ELL	20	38	39	33	37	35	11	52			
ASN	79	62		91	59		69	80	76		
BLK	39	40	24	35	38	25	33	61	65		
HSP	53	56	49	51	41	38	44	67	50		
MUL	59	54	47	59	49	35	58	68	79		
WHT	63	58	46	67	54	42	54	79	63		
FRL	49	50	39	48	43	35	43	64	51		

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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	47
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	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	43
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	
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	54
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	59
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	48
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 with disabilities in science, math, and language arts show the lowest performance. The ESSA federal index score for SWD has been below 32% for the past two years. Math FSA performance of lowest 25th percentile decreased from 46% to 39% proficient. Math proficiency decreased 18% from 7th grade FSA proficiency to 8th grade proficiency.
One factor impacting the decrease in proficiency from 7th to 8th grade is the acceleration model that we follow to provide more students with challenging Algebra curriculum, thus leaving a higher percentage of struggling math students in FSA tested classes.
Lack of progress monitoring and feedback and reflection, along with inconsistent inclusive practices, have led to students performing below grade level.

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

There are multiple declining data sources. Math lowest 25th percentile decreased from 46% to 39% and Science proficiency decreased from 53% to 48%. Multiple subgroups experienced a decrease within science proficiency: BLK 33% to 23%, ELL 29% to 21%, SWD 15% to 13%, HSP 44% to 35%.

In addition to the contributing factors above, science classes did not experience consistent performance, hands on activities and assessments. Early in the school year, one 8th grade science teacher quit and due to the teacher shortage the position was not able to be filled. Classes were dissolved and students were absorbed into the other classes.

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.

Eighth grade math proficiency is 7% below the state average, school wide math lowest 25th Percentile is 39% proficiency compared to the state proficiency of 51%. Science was 3 points below the state average.

A variety of factors could have contributed to these discrepancies. For example, personnel changes, inconsistent inclusive practices, no intensive math class, lack of prescribed progress monitoring tool, lack of vertical alignment when students transition to middle school.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile from 45% to 52% has shown the most improvement.

Several new actions were implemented in 2018-19 school year. The ESE push-in teacher for ELA demonstrated an effective model that promoted co-teaching and collaborative planning with the general education teacher. Reading Plus progress monitoring was implemented school wide and data was discussed and monitored. Goal-setting was implemented for students and supported by the Literacy Coach. The literacy coach worked with all MESH teachers to support comprehension and AVID strategies.

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

Two potential areas of concern are 329 identified students with Attendance below 90 percent and 241 students
that earned a Level 1 on at least one statewide assessment.

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

1. Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% for 2 Years
2. Science SWD ELL BLK HSP
3. Math L25

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	48% of all students passed the Science FSA in 2019, which was a 3% discrepancy compared to the state and a 5% discrepancy from the year before. Only 13% of SWD students showed achievement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year at Central Middle School, 25% of students on the cusp of making a learning gain ("Bubble Kids"), will show positive growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lorri Benjamin (benjamin.lorri@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Central Middle School will implement AVID strategies and science interventions with data based feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By improving performance in weak content areas students will better develop the foundational skills necessary for growth. Using inquiry based lessons, students who have struggled with content in more traditional settings have opportunity to master the skills. Differentiating instruction offers the opportunity to satisfy student needs. Evidence used includes analysis of state, district and school wide performances on individual strands of the Science FCAT.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify Bubble students Using student's 5th grade Science FCAT scores teachers will identify students by their reasonable potential growth. Teachers can also use students FSA ELA scores from students 6th and 7th grade years respectively. "Bubble students" are those who are on the marginal cusp between achievement levels. 2. Meet in PLCs to plan implementation of skills days The Science department will be implementing school wide "Skills Days" targeting weak science content areas. Skills days lessons will be designed to support improvement in these areas through inquiry based lessons and progress monitoring. 3. Implement strategies to support all students with a focus on SWD students One such strategy includes AVID Focused Note Taking skills. Teachers will also focus on test taking strategies that help facilitate students with breaking down questions, item analysis and identification of misconceptions. All teachers will use schoolwide organizational tools such as the AVID binder and Student Planner Handbooks. 4. Science PLC analyzes student samples of focused note-taking strategies 5. First year Central is using the ASD 'Home Base' model created to support students in a regular education setting to support those students specifically. 6. Progress monitoring using the Skills Days assessments Each Skills Days lesson will be accompanied with formative progress monitoring to help

determine which students need additional interventions.

7. Science teachers will use the progress monitoring data to differentiate and provide further remediation.

8. Admin and science teachers conduct walk throughs with district science resource teacher. Admin uses data to provide feedback to teachers, teachers use observations to improve own practice, and district resource teacher collecting trend data to share with department and admin.

9. BPIE team meets regularly to problem solve, facilitate two stakeholder input round table sessions, and make adjustments based on this input and problem solving. Problem solving will emphasize SWD achievement and goal setting, giving everyone more of a voice in educational planning.

Person Responsible	Lorri Benjamin (benjamin.lorri@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	Only 27% of Central Middle's SWD (Students with Disabilities) subgroup demonstrated proficiency on their end of year math assessment. Our 'Lowest 25%' missed the statewide average of students demonstrating proficiency by 12% and fell short of the district average by 6%. Overall, our students struggled to show math learning gains –only 51% total showed learning gains which is 4 percent short of the district average and 6% shy of the state average. For the past 2 years students in our SWD subgroup performed below the 32% Federal Index expectation. In 2018-2019, 0 students with disabilities were enrolled in Algebra 1
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	35% of our students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency on their end of year math assessment. 55% of our students school-wide will show learning gains on FSA math. We will have add 15 Acceleration points to our overall score.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lorri Benjamin (benjamin.lorri@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	FOCUS note-taking (AVID/WICOR) Organization instruction (AVID/WICOR) Student placement in advanced math classes Peer (teacher) modeling/observation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	"Algebra is the foundation for students' future success in science, technology, engineering, and math." "Taking the course earlier in their academic careers allows students sufficient time to take the more advanced courses that are often prerequisites for postsecondary STEM majors. " NOV 2018 | U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION WICOR is AVID's proven learning support structure that incorporates teaching and learning methods in critical areas to help students comprehend and present ideas at higher levels of understanding.

Action Step

Description	1. All 7th grade students are enrolled in Math 2 Advanced or higher 2. Analyze Data to place students in Algebra 1 3. Hold an Algebra 1 parent informational night 4. Utilize school wide AVID binder to organize math materials/notes 5. Use focused note taking strategies in math class 6. Math PLC analyzes student samples of focused note-taking strategies 7. Implement progress monitoring using MAPS 8. First year implementing ASD 'Home Base' model is created to support students in a regular education setting 9. ESE Resource teacher will push-in to 8th grade math classes to offer support to SWD in their math class 10. 7th grade SWD are exposed to general education math classes using the inclusion model 11. Additional support offered to all students via online tutorials and 'face to face' tutoring by math teachers 12. Boot camp will be held in the spring to review Algebra and focus on ESE students

13. Teachers will model lessons using effective strategies for their peers.
14. Learning strategies teacher will incorporate foundational math skill lessons into their classes.
15. BPIE team meets regularly to problem solve, facilitate two stakeholder input round table sessions, and make adjustments based on this input and problem solving. Problem solving will emphasize SWD achievement and goal setting, giving everyone more of a voice in educational planning.
16. Admin observing math instruction and giving regular feedback

Person Responsible Lorri Benjamin (benjamin.lorri@brevardschools.org)

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).