

Hernando County School District

Powell Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Powell Middle School

4100 BARCLAY AVE, Brooksville, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pms>

Demographics

Principal: Alex Rasttater

Start Date for this Principal: 9/14/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 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%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Powell Middle School

4100 BARCLAY AVE, Brooksville, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pms>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>79%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>44%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
Fischer, Renee	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Pointer, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Intensive Math Department Chair
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.
Vermette, Holly	Teacher, K-12	7th Grade Team Leader

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Young, Serena	Teacher, K-12	Performing Arts Department Chair
Fry, Deonne	Teacher, K-12	Intensive Reading Department Chair
Record, Alex	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Team Leader
Haskins, Marcy	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
Kufner, Cindy	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/14/2020, Alex Rasttater

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

66

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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%)
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 .	

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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

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	
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	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

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	
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	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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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%				
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%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		

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
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
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although Powell has always worked to align assessments with the standards, teaching and assessing to the rigor of the standard has become more of a focus. As we have looked at student assessment data (both formative and standardized, we have noticed that students were pretty successful with the moderate/easy questions, but struggled on the higher-level questions.

Measurable Outcome: Powell will see a steady increase in the percentage of students that are performing on grade level with a heavily tested, rigorous standard (varied by subject area)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: According to Marzano and Toth (2014), "students must begin to live in a land of cognitive complexity." Powell will work to promote students consistently working with cognitively complex standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If students can work through the tougher standards and build endurance to tackle the higher-level questions, they will be more likely to succeed on the Florida Standards Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

Departments will meet during PLCs with administration to identify the standard of focus and develop common formatives that will be given quarterly throughout the year (each one including questions from that same standard). Departments will bring examples of students' work to PLCs to determine if students are working within the desired level of rigor.

Person Responsible Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Students with Disabilities was a flagged subgroup for Powell. ESE Co-teachers have been strategically placed within departments to share a common planning. During this time, teachers are working together to identify how to best support those students with the rigorous standards. ESE teachers will be collecting and sharing formative data on ESE students during PLCs. Student data chats will be taking place in all subject areas.

Person Responsible Alex Rastatter (rastatter_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

NA

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Powell Middle School runs a PBIS program recognized by the state of Florida for the 2019-2020 school year as a Gold Level model school program. We have a robust PBIS committee with teachers from all grade levels and curriculum areas as well as students from each grade level. We meet monthly to plan special campus wide events and develop ways of recognizing students and staff for their efforts. We are currently in the process of moving forward with creating community connections and sponsors to enhance our Panther Pride program. We will be having sponsored Panther Pride Fridays to build and enhance pride in our school, have enhanced student and staff recognition with trophies and awards, and are developing team and moral building events that are a part of our monthly staff celebration faculty meetings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.