

Pasco County Schools

Centennial 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Centennial Middle School

38505 CENTENNIAL RD, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://cenms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Rick Saylor R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 Pasco 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Centennial Middle School

38505 CENTENNIAL RD, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://cenms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

Centennial Middle School creates a STEM/LATIC culture of excellence; a safe and friendly school with a challenging curriculum where all students receive a world-class education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Centennial Middle School provides a world-class STEM/LATIC education for all students.

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
Saylor, Rick	Principal	
Switzer, Jessi	Teacher, K-12	
Salyer, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	
Morris, Sharon	Assistant Principal	
Vance, Madonna	Psychologist	
Huckabee, Carlene	Teacher, K-12	
Wolff, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Roberts, Kristin	School Counselor	
Carroll, Scotty	Instructional Coach	
Caparaso, Mary	Teacher, ESE	
Lewis, Alpha	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Price, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Rulison, Kim	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Rick Saylor R

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.*

0

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

40

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	179	203	201	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	14	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	38	49	0	0	0	0	105
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	
Course failures in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	53	64	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 Statewide ELA or Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	66	62	0	0	0	0	191

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	39	54	52	0	0	0	0	145

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

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	235	212	273	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	16	40	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	65	0	0	0	0	119
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	34	95	0	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	73	131	0	0	0	0	298

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	43	42	103	0	0	0	0	188

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	235	212	273	0	0	0	0	720	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	16	40	0	0	0	0	96	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	65	0	0	0	0	119	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	34	95	0	0	0	0	150	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	73	131	0	0	0	0	298	

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	43	42	103	0	0	0	0	188	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	42%	52%	54%	41%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	55%	54%	46%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	47%	47%	32%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	46%	60%	58%	42%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	50%	61%	57%	51%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	51%	42%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	52%	51%	36%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	68%	72%	61%	70%	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	45%	56%	-11%	54%	-9%
	2018	32%	51%	-19%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	35%	51%	-16%	52%	-17%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	49%	58%	-9%	56%	-7%
	2018	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	19%	42%	-23%	54%	-35%
	2018	22%	44%	-22%	54%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
08	2019	54%	68%	-14%	46%	8%
	2018	49%	63%	-14%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	44%	54%	-10%	48%	-4%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	50%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	55%	70%	-15%	71%	-16%
2018	61%	71%	-10%	71%	-10%
Compare		-6%			
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	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%
2018	100%	63%	37%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	13	39	40	19	38	35	19	27			
ELL	8	38	40	19	35	37		24			

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
BLK	20	36	38	24	33	38		24			
HSP	37	50	41	39	47	44	42	49	56		
MUL	48	58		52	46						
WHT	48	55	41	53	55	44	49	66	56		
FRL	35	47	39	39	45	41	37	49	53		
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	8	26	28	15	41	41	15	41			
ELL	17	32	29	18	38	44		27			
BLK	16	37	44	27	44	35	20				
HSP	35	38	30	36	45	45	47	56	59		
MUL	27	41		32	32						
WHT	44	39	24	47	52	53	51	69	37		
FRL	32	36	29	37	47	48	41	55	43		
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	37	26	16	45	41	18	32			
ELL	13	29	17	14	35						
BLK	25	45	50	26	48	41	18	47			
HSP	40	45	23	38	47	33	26	59	60		
MUL	22	29		35	53						
WHT	44	48	33	46	53	48	44	63	58		
FRL	35	43	30	36	46	42	28	56	41		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	51
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	52
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 proficiency. We continue to make improvements in this area (grew 3 points from last year). We have many students who are behind academically in reading and have multiple interventions in place to better assist them.

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

Our Civics proficiency decreased by 7 points. We had one brand new teacher and one teacher with only 1 year of experience in this subject area. We have made some instructional staffing changes in this year that we feel will help us to improve in proficiency for next school year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The area of civics proficiency. We had one brand new teacher and one teacher with only 1 year of experience in this subject area. We have made some instructional staffing changes in this year that we feel will help us to improve in proficiency for next school year.

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

Learning gains in ELA. We had a major focus on writing across the school which we felt helped us see this large improvement. We plan to continue it for next year and have revised our plan to have even greater growth.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Course failures for our 8th graders is a concern for us. We are implementing a new system through our intervention period (homeroom) where we are having students track their grades more in order to help more students to be successful.

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

1. ELA Proficiency (including learning gains and learning gains for lowest 25%)
2. Math Proficiency (including learning gains and learning gains for lowest 25%)
3. Science Proficiency
4. Civics Proficiency
5. Course Failures

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PD for staff in regard to engagement (especially with mySchool Online students) Further parent communication in regard to academic achievement (through a variety of methods)
Measurable Outcome:	10% increase in student achievement across all areas 10% increase in the amount of students on-track for academics
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District PD and Content Resources
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our district staff is assisting with PD in regard to student engagement.

Action Steps to Implement

PD from District Content Specialists
Support from IDE Coach
Walk-throughs from District Content Specialists, LDCs, and Admin
Modeling of specific actions
Increased parent communication (School Messenger, Phone calls, Emails, Google Voice Texts)
• 5 E's Learning Plan implementation (at a deeper level including extension and enrichment learning activities)
• Increased student choice in regard to learning activities on the 5E's Learning Plan
• STEM activity per Learning Plan
• Relevant and engaging STEM Challenges/ALU Tasks
• Rigorous-standards based learning activities
• Purposeful facilitation and Tier II supports
Increase Tier II supports for students (through 5 E's Enrichment)
• Increase Tier II supports during STORM Center
• Student Data Chats for all students during 1st quarter
• Grade-level SIT meetings to focus on Tier II
• School Intervention Team (meet w/Tier III students)
• Increased enrichment opportunities for students
• Revised Backpack Dump/Grade Review with new student planner

Person Responsible Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School Leadership Team will continue to monitor the School Wide Data and goals and make changes as needed for increased student success.

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.

- Weekly SRP Feedback forms
- Weekly Teacher Feedback forms
- Additional Face-to-Face Teacher meetings
- Further implementation of PBIS rewards for students and staff
- Increased On-Track and PBIS activities for students
- Continue to stay focused on PLC cycle with Content PLCs
- Increase in hands-on learning opportunities for students
- Pineappling for teachers to improve in their practice and also as a focus for the Deliberate Practice areas
- AVID strategies (school culture, college culture)

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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