Barrington Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Barrington Middle School

5925 VILLAGE CENTER DR, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Cummings   Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

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)	37%
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 (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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

Barrington Middle School

5925 VILLAGE CENTER DR, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

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	36%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Barrington Middle School will create a climate of responsibility and exploration as it enables adolescents to demonstrate academic and social growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Barrington Middle School will create a collegiate atmosphere and prepare all students to reach their highest potential.

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
Rappleyea, Amy	Principal	According to the Wallace Foundation, the role of the principal is to 1. Shape a vision of academic success for all students 2. Create a climate hospitable to education 3. Cultivate leadership in others 4. Improve instruction 5. Manage people, data, and processes. Specifically, Ms. Rappleyea is involved in the following at Barrington -frequent communication with Parents and Staff through ParentLink messages at least once per week -leads monthly faculty meetings designed to improve instruction and increase communication amongst faculty and staff members -monitors faculty and students through Canvas usage, HCPS dashboards -Covid Captain -leads meetings with administration at least once per week
Richman, Paula	SAC Member	Mrs. Richman is the SAC Chair at Barrington and also teaches 7th & 8th grade science. She is responsible for: -Communicating with stakeholders about the School Improvement Plan -Working with others to develop, approve, and submit the School Improvement Plan -Leading and coordinating SAC meetings throughout the year

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/24/2020, Andrea Cummings

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

84

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)	37%
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 (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	410	430	520	0	0	0	0	1360
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	74	76	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	8
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	59	48	50	0	0	0	0	157
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	58	50	0	0	0	0	179

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	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	4	5	12	0	0	0	0	21
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	1	493	548	569	0	0	0	0	1611
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	41	44	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	20	30	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	96	98	0	0	0	0	314
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	73	75	0	0	0	0	248

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	76	65	59	0	0	0	0	200

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	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	39	51	0	0	0	0	140

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	1	493	548	569	0	0	0	0	1611
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	41	44	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	20	30	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	96	98	0	0	0	0	314
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	73	75	0	0	0	0	248

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	76	65	59	0	0	0	0	200

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	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	39	51	0	0	0	0	140

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	65%	51%	54%	63%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	52%	54%	58%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	47%	47%	48%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	75%	55%	58%	73%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	57%	69%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	56%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	56%	47%	51%	50%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	67%	72%	83%	66%	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	65%	53%	12%	54%	11%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	63%	54%	9%	52%	11%
	2018	66%	52%	14%	51%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	66%	53%	13%	56%	10%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	71%	49%	22%	55%	16%
	2018	67%	48%	19%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	80%	62%	18%	54%	26%
	2018	78%	61%	17%	54%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	36%	31%	5%	46%	-10%
	2018	30%	29%	1%	45%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	57%	47%	10%	48%	9%
	2018	58%	48%	10%	50%	8%
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%	67%	14%	71%	10%
2018	78%	65%	13%	71%	7%
Compare	3%				
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	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	85%	63%	22%	62%	23%
Compare		8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	57%	36%	57%	36%
2018	96%	56%	40%	56%	40%
Compare		-3%			

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	28	45	38	37	40	29	19	58	67		
ELL	25	53	55	42	66	61	33	50			
ASN	89	71		92	85		92	93	93		
BLK	53	51	43	63	64	50	37	75	74		
HSP	54	59	59	67	64	48	43	79	78		
MUL	66	59	52	74	68	59	68	81	68		
WHT	72	60	40	82	71	53	65	86	88		
FRL	46	51	48	58	57	45	31	70	71		
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	30	43	35	34	46	34	23	42	79		
ELL	31	54	50	36	42	27	19	38			
ASN	76	48		81	73		64	92	100		
BLK	57	60	57	61	55	48	43	76	77		
HSP	53	57	49	60	56	43	46	67	78		
MUL	65	69	50	72	65	29	73	88	81		
WHT	73	62	51	77	65	48	66	85	80		
FRL	51	56	50	56	53	40	45	65	71		
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	21	39	38	40	60	56	16	59	42		
ELL	19	37	34	29	47	39	18	48			
ASN	72	71		79	71			90			
BLK	45	48	47	61	67	55	23	81	74		
HSP	49	50	45	62	64	47	39	70	80		
MUL	71	71	79	81	73	77	59	80	72		
WHT	72	62	50	80	73	64	58	90	83		

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
FRL	38	44	41	53	57	47	27	68	61		

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	65
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	651
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	49
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	88
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	57
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	61
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	66
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	69
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	53
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.

In 2019, The students with disabilities had an achievement of 19% in science. The SWD group also performed below the school in ELA, which could have contributed to the low science score.

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

In 2019, the Black students showed the largest decline in gains on the ELA. Of particular concern, the bottom quartile (L25) Black students, dropped from 57% to 43% ELA gains or a drop of 14%. The other largest decline was the percentage of students with free and reduced lunch who were on or above grade level in science. The FRL performance in science dropped from 45% to 31% which is also a decline of 14%.

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.

In 2019, Grade 8 Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. With more students taking algebra, there were less students taking the Grade 8 Math FSA.

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

In 2019, the percentage of students taking algebra increased from 85% to 93%. This was accomplished by carefully placing students into appropriate courses.

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

The percentage of students with free or reduced lunch who scored on or above grade level in science is of concern.

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

1. Increase the percentage of students with free and reduced lunch performing at or above grade level in science
2. Increase vocabulary understanding, usage and application in both reading and writing in the content areas to decrease the number of students at L1 ELA.
3. Continue to incorporate the use of WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, Reading) strategies to increase student achievement school wide and across content levels.
4. Continue to improve teacher craft and use of high impact strategies in all content areas to increase student achievement school wide and across content levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The economically disadvantaged students at Barrington performed much lower on the science in 2019 (31%) than 2018 (45%). They also perform much lower than the school average of 57%.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end the of 2020-2021 school year, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students performing on or above grade level in science will increase from 31% in 2019 to 34% in 2021 as measured on the Statewide Science Assessment (SSA) and/or district level assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Rappleyea (amy.rappleyea@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Barrington will increase the number of 8th grade students taking the high school level science course to increase scientific thinking.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By increasing the scientific thinking opportunities, students will more likely be able to use the critical thinking skills and think globally when presented scenarios.

Action Steps to Implement

Examine students' past coursework and grades to determine eligibility for Physical Science Honors (high school credit course).

Person Responsible Amy Rappleyea (amy.rappleyea@hcps.net)

Make sure all students in the Physical Science Honors course, especially those with lower reading & math scores, have appropriate supports through AVID and WICOR.

Person Responsible Amy Rappleyea (amy.rappleyea@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Use of a school-wide Positive Behavior System (PBS) encourages and reinforces our high expectations at Barrington. Our PBS involves "Lightning Strikes" that the students utilize to purchase rewards. Our business partners help support our PBS store through donations.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00