Farnell Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Farnell Middle School

13912 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kelinda Lockett

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)	29%
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 (75%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (71%)
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

Farnell Middle School

13912 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[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	25%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

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
Binder, Tim	Principal	Instructional leader
Streeter, David	Assistant Principal	APA

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, Kelinda Lockett

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.*
8

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
65

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)	29%
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 (75%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (71%)
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	374	389	415	0	0	0	0	1178
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	26	36	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	16	0	0	0	0	34
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	27	37	24	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	45	22	0	0	0	0	93

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	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8
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	0	434	407	420	0	0	0	0	1261
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	27	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	10	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	29	37	0	0	0	0	123

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	9	5	15	0	0	0	0	29

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	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	6

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	434	407	420	0	0	0	0	1261
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	27	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	10	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	29	37	0	0	0	0	123

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	9	5	15	0	0	0	0	29

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	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	6

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	79%	51%	54%	79%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	52%	54%	71%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	47%	47%	60%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	81%	55%	58%	87%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	72%	57%	57%	82%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	52%	51%	76%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	74%	47%	51%	76%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	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	78%	53%	25%	54%	24%
	2018	74%	52%	22%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	78%	54%	24%	52%	26%
	2018	75%	52%	23%	51%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	78%	53%	25%	56%	22%
	2018	82%	54%	28%	58%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	71%	49%	22%	55%	16%
	2018	74%	48%	26%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	83%	62%	21%	54%	29%
	2018	85%	61%	24%	54%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	43%	31%	12%	46%	-3%
	2018	56%	29%	27%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	74%	47%	27%	48%	26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	79%	48%	31%	50%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	86%	67%	19%	71%	15%
2018	86%	65%	21%	71%	15%
Compare		0%			
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	36	50	50	40	51	48	15	57	67		
ELL	54	71	67	64	73	56	66	74	85		

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	91	80	75	94	84		88	94	95		
BLK	67	62	73	71	70	56	55	91	95		
HSP	64	62	58	68	64	54	71	76	87		
MUL	79	59	54	85	64	70	53	77	88		
WHT	83	69	61	84	74	68	77	90	89		
FRL	66	60	53	70	64	55	56	75	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	36	50	49	51	59	54	39	56	64		
ELL	53	66	60	69	78	70	43	78	81		
ASN	87	84	57	96	88	73	89	95	96		
BLK	75	67	48	70	69	57	62	91	100		
HSP	67	69	56	75	75	66	70	78	90		
MUL	80	72		78	74	70	79	100	86		
WHT	82	67	59	87	81	72	83	87	94		
FRL	66	66	56	73	76	67	71	75	90		

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	26	47	43	44	68	70	18	42			
ELL	44	54	40	66	76	71	50	61	92		
ASN	88	77	54	97	94	92	91	96	99		
BLK	73	72	53	80	81	80	61	71	95		
HSP	68	66	56	76	75	65	65	84	94		
MUL	82	78	57	92	80	92	72	100	90		
WHT	82	72	65	89	82	79	78	95	93		
FRL	63	64	60	72	78	69	56	78	84		

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	76
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	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	763
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	70
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	87
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	71
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	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	77
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 and Math lowest 25 percent

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

ELA and Math lowest 25 percent

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.

All data sets were above the state average

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

ELA lowest 25 percent. This improvement is statistically insignificant

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

All subgroups hit the mark

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

1. Engagement
2. Rigor

3. Differentiated Instruction
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Anecdotal evidence gleaned from classroom observations revealed a need for increased student engagement
Measurable Outcome:	We will compare the average rating score in the teacher observation rubric for Domain 3C to last year's average
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Binder (tim.binder@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This is the only strategy available.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule professional development opportunities once teachers feel comfortable with all of the District mandated curriculum and learning platforms.

Person Responsible	Tim Binder (tim.binder@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Professional Development as needed

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.

There is an expectation of respect for all

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: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00