

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Coleman 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	17

Coleman Middle School

1724 S MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

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)	17%
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 (76%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (73%)
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

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	17

Coleman Middle School

1724 S MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">29%</p>

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.

To provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

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
Pritchard, Odalys	Principal	School Leader, Campus Safety, Instructional Leader, Supervision, Community Liasion, Staff Management and Development
Carr, Sharnel	Assistant Principal	Student Discipline, Facilities, Supervision, Community Liasion, Staff Management and Development

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/2/2020, Anthony Jones

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.*

5

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

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)	17%
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 (76%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (73%)
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	331	349	339	0	0	0	0	1019
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	14	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	19	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	16	0	0	0	59	

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	3	3	0	0	0	6

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Friday 10/30/2020

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	346	353	328	0	0	0	0	1027
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	13	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	24	17	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	24	19	0	0	0	0	72

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	3	6	3	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	346	353	328	0	0	0	0	1027
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	13	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	24	17	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	24	19	0	0	0	0	72

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	3	6	3	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	82%	51%	54%	81%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	52%	54%	68%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	47%	47%	63%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	87%	55%	58%	87%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	74%	57%	57%	77%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	51%	66%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	71%	47%	51%	73%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	67%	72%	91%	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	81%	53%	28%	54%	27%
	2018	85%	52%	33%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	82%	54%	28%	52%	30%
	2018	75%	52%	23%	51%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	81%	53%	28%	56%	25%
	2018	85%	54%	31%	58%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	82%	49%	33%	55%	27%
	2018	81%	48%	33%	52%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	89%	62%	27%	54%	35%
	2018	90%	61%	29%	54%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	55%	31%	24%	46%	9%
	2018	45%	29%	16%	45%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	71%	47%	24%	48%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	70%	48%	22%	50%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	67%	24%	71%	20%
2018	87%	65%	22%	71%	16%
Compare		4%			

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	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
2018	96%	63%	33%	62%	34%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	44	42	33	48	49	56	41	54	69		
ELL	43	62	58	54	56	42					

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
ASN	88	58		97	82		67	73	100		
BLK	64	58		75	74	80	30				
HSP	70	60	56	76	66	59	64	86	82		
MUL	80	63	67	84	76		85	84	100		
WHT	85	68	57	89	75	66	74	93	88		
FRL	72	62	55	74	62	55	55	81	85		
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	41	48	40	46	50	47	29	50	56		
ELL	52	53	53	70	63	43		69			
ASN	90	70		90	78			100	100		
BLK	62	63	62	50	50	55					
HSP	62	56	48	77	73	63	42	71	78		
MUL	76	67		89	77	80	72	92	100		
WHT	86	68	59	89	77	67	77	91	90		
FRL	69	57	57	71	62	56	51	71	84		
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	29	52	51	48	55	50	30	63			
ELL	63	66	72	80	67	64	30		50		
ASN	91	88		100	97		81		100		
BLK	41	44	45	41	38	31					
HSP	64	61	57	77	68	59	57	70	76		
MUL	81	77		91	90			100			
WHT	85	68	66	90	78	72	76	94	90		
FRL	66	62	61	74	71	57	62	85	82		

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	77
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	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	766
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	57
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	81
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	64
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	69
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	80
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	79
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	67
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 Lowest Quartile Gains is our lowest performing area (56%). This is consistent with prior year data (57%), thus it is a 2 year trend.

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

ELL Math achievement fell from 70% in 2018 to 54% in 2019. This could be in part to varying levels of language acquisition from year to year among tested students.

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.

We exceed the state average in all 8 school grade categories. In 7 of the 8 categories, we exceed the state by double digits. We are closest to the state average with our ELA BQ. CMS is 56%, HCPS is 47% and State is 47% (9% difference).

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

We had a 4% point gain in Social Studies Achievement going from 87% in 2018 to 91% in 2019 (+4%). New teachers were added in 2018 with extensive knowledge of teaching civics.

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

Our SWD data is closest to the minimum threshold for Federal Index of 41% Currently 47% .

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

1. Differentiation/small group instruction
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Differentiation, o included small group instruction, can positively impact our learning gain and sub-group data.

Measurable Outcome: ELA BQ gains will increase from 56% to 60%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Odalys Pritchard (odalys.pritchard@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group Learning
Teacher Clarity
Teacher Knowledge of Students

Small Group learning has an effect size of .47 on Hatties Visible Learning Research. It is also part of our new Instructional Frameworks in HCPS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher Clarity has an effect size of .75 on Hatties Visible Learning Research. Teacher clarity refers to students being clear as to what they are learning, why the learning is important and how they will be assessed on their learning.

Teacher Knowledge of Students or "teacher estimates of achievement.": " This rating reflects the accuracy of an individual teacher's knowledge of students in his or her classes and how that knowledge determines the kinds of classroom activities and materials as well as the difficulty of the tasks assigned. "

Action Steps to Implement

Meet with ILT to discuss Strategies, determine specific next steps, professional learning opportunities, and progress monitoring benchmarks.

Person Responsible Odalys Pritchard (odalys.pritchard@hcps.net)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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.

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.

Weekly "Coleman Cobra Connection to staff by Principal with updates, motivational messages and Professional Learning.

Instructional Leadership Team to support teaching and learning at CMS

Development of Tier 1 system for student expectations and positive behavior based on COBRA acronym

Student incentives program and opportunities (honor roll, spirit days, etc)

Student clubs (Robotics, Girls who Code and more)

PTSA and multiple business partners/sponsors, monthly PTSA newsletter

SAC Committee

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00