Taylor County Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Taylor County Middle School

601 E LAFAYETTE ST, Perry, FL 32347

https://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_middle_school

Demographics

Principal: Kasey Roberts

Start Date for this Principal: 9/22/2020

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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

Taylor County Middle School

601 E LAFAYETTE ST, Perry, FL 32347

https://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_middle_school

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	No	98%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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.

The mission of Taylor County Middle School is to provide a safe environment, an educational program that contributes to the development of each student as an individual in order for him or her to successfully function in our continually changing, diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for our students to be the primary focus of all educational decisions of the school. We believe that our students need to apply their learning in a meaningful context and need to be instructed in a variety of ways to support their learning process and engage them in the learning process.

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
Puhl, Kiki	Principal	
Joiner, Ann	Instructional Coach	
Roberts, Kasey	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 9/22/2020, Kasey Roberts

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, 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	228	213	189	0	0	0	0	630
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	30	25	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	22	18	0	0	0	0	60
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	

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	36	33	41	0	0	0	0	110

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

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	227	196	180	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	34	23	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	28	40	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	56	57	0	0	0	0	174

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	36	33	41	0	0	0	0	110

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
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	227	196	180	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	34	23	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	28	40	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	56	57	0	0	0	0	174

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	36	33	41	0	0	0	0	110

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
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	50%	50%	54%	41%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	54%	48%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	47%	46%	46%	44%
Math Achievement	53%	53%	58%	42%	42%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	61%	57%	46%	46%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	47%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	44%	51%	47%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	67%	72%	53%	53%	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	43%	42%	1%	54%	-11%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	48%	1%	52%	-3%
	2018	43%	42%	1%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%
	2018	44%	44%	0%	58%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	53%	2%	54%	1%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	54%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	19%	17%	2%	46%	-27%
	2018	41%	41%	0%	45%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	44%	42%	2%	48%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	39%	1%	50%	-10%
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	65%	65%	0%	71%	-6%
2018	58%	57%	1%	71%	-13%
Compare		7%			

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	82%	52%	30%	61%	21%
2018	90%	46%	44%	62%	28%
Compare		-8%			

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	38	61	56	41	55	50	54	45			
BLK	37	49	35	38	49	37	27	45	90		
HSP	63	79		79	79						

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
MUL	45	57		34	59		45				
WHT	54	57	61	59	64	58	51	73	87		
FRL	44	54	55	47	58	53	40	61	86		
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	29	46	49	40	60	53	17	53			
ASN	75	82		83	73						
BLK	30	48	48	39	56	49	25	51	100		
HSP	32	44		58	83						
MUL	48	52		52	57			33			
WHT	53	53	42	59	64	64	43	66	88		
FRL	36	47	43	47	61	56	31	53	82		
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	36	32	20	46	53	28	16			
BLK	25	33	36	31	40	53	31	43	89		
HSP	22	62		28	20						
MUL	46	50		33	36						
WHT	48	53	51	48	50	50	54	56	83		
FRL	41	48	46	42	46	47	47	53	75		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	522
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	45
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	75
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	48
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	63
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	55
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.

Continuing with 2018-19 data- TCMS' lowest data component was Math. Overall learning gains as well as lowest quartile learning gains both saw a decline, along with higher grade performance.
Due to Covid students were not given the FSA in 2020.Based

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

In 2018-19 our data indicated that 8th grade was the lowest component.

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.

Due to Covid students were not given the FSA.

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

In 2018-19- Civics showed the most improvement. Instructional changes occurred as well as the implementation of new progress monitoring that was conducted three times throughout the year. Due to Covid students were not given the FSA.

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

Based on the fact that we have 210 students in TEC out of 630 students, we have not been able to pinpoint students that are in TEC and make sure they are accessing all information in CANVAS correctly. We are working on this and hope that this issues can be resolved.

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

1.
2.

3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Leadership teams will be involved in an Diversity Training/ Book Study called White Fragility. This book will discuss many areas concerning racism and uncomfortable conversations.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable goal would be to encourage teachers to become apart of the same book study and have more restorative practice conversations with students and other staff members.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kiki Puhl (kiki.puhl@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teaching strategies that will help adults and students with Racism.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rational for this strategy is the ongoing issues in our country today. This has stirred many uncomfortable feelings amongst adults and students. We feel that this is a good time to address these issues and teach strategies to all.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Dipping in to B.E.S. T. standards for ELA and Math
Measurable Outcome:	To become familiar with the BEST Math and ELA Standards. To Become familiar with Course Descriptions
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Making sure the BEST standards are aligned to our curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Safety and School Mental Health are two other areas of focus for TCMS. In-school safety drills as well as simulation drills are being conducted throughout the school year to better prepare in cases of emergency. IN addition, mental health training for all staff members and students are scheduled.

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.

During Covid we are limited in how we can approach this issue. We have purchased a platform called Canvas. It is a platform that houses announcements, grades, assignments and more. Teachers can communicate with parents through Canvas. Other stakeholders in the community are actively involved with TCMS. They provide luncheons, support for our students and teachers. When Covid restrictions are released we have mentoring groups that support our students 3 days per week.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**