

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Ferrell Middle Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>19</b> |

# Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Cara Diehl**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (65%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)<br>2016-17: B (60%)<br>2015-16: A (63%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>19</b> |

# Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School<br/>6-8</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>84%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>                                     | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>87%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | A              | A              | A              | B              |

## 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.**

We empower our girls to excel in rigorous academics and character education while fostering them to be positive forces in our global community.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Developing confident, dynamic, educated young women.

### 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 |
|---------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
| French, Karen | Principal |                                 |
|               |           |                                 |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Cara Diehl

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

**Demographic Data**

|   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)                | Active                 |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | K-12 General Education |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>                           | Yes                    |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (65%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)<br>2016-17: B (60%)<br>2015-16: A (63%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

**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 | 155 | 198 | 172 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 525 |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33  | 51  | 47  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 131 |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3   |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 3   | 4   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 32  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 82  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35  | 57  | 33  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 125 |



**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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 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 | 11 | 5  | 3  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 29 | 17 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 46 |

**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 | 230 | 194 | 188 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 612 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 6   | 10  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 28  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 56  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 15  | 22  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 38  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 72  | 59  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 238 |

**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 | 8 | 35 | 32 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 75 |

**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  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 4  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 34 |

**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 | 230 | 194 | 188 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 612 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 6   | 10  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 28  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 56  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 15  | 22  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 38  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 72  | 59  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 238 |

**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 | 8 | 35 | 32 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 75 |

**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  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 4  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 34 |

**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             | 53%    | 51%      | 54%   | 49%    | 50%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 60%    | 52%      | 54%   | 50%    | 53%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 58%    | 47%      | 47%   | 40%    | 45%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 62%    | 55%      | 58%   | 60%    | 54%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 72%    | 57%      | 57%   | 66%    | 59%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 75%    | 52%      | 51%   | 58%    | 51%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 43%    | 47%      | 51%   | 48%    | 47%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 75%    | 67%      | 72%   | 76%    | 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 | 51%    | 53%      | -2%                        | 54%   | -3%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 52%      | -5%                        | 52%   | -5%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 54%    | 54%      | 0%                         | 52%   | 2%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 45%    | 52%      | -7%                        | 51%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 54%    | 53%      | 1%                         | 56%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 53%    | 54%      | -1%                        | 58%   | -5%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 48%    | 49%      | -1%                        | 55%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 50%    | 48%      | 2%                         | 52%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 65%    | 62%      | 3%                         | 54%   | 11%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 63%    | 61%      | 2%                         | 54%   | 9%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 44%    | 31%      | 13%                        | 46%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 29%      | 25%                        | 45%   | 9%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -19%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 43%    | 47%      | -4%                        | 48%   | -5%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 53%    | 48%      | 5%                         | 50%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>CIVICS EOC</b>   |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 75%           | 67%             | 8%                           | 71%          | 4%                        |
| 2018                | 75%           | 65%             | 10%                          | 71%          | 4%                        |
| Compare             |               | 0%              |                              |              |                           |
| <b>HISTORY EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 92%           | 63%             | 29%                          | 61%          | 31%                       |
| 2018                | 95%           | 63%             | 32%                          | 62%          | 33%                       |
| Compare             |               | -3%             |                              |              |                           |
| <b>GEOMETRY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 90%           | 57%             | 33%                          | 57%          | 33%                       |
| 2018                | 100%          | 56%             | 44%                          | 56%          | 44%                       |
| Compare             |               | -10%            |                              |              |                           |

**Subgroup Data**

| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| SWD  | 15              | 44            | 47                 | 28               | 58             | 74                  | 12              | 32             |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 33              | 55            | 59                 | 58               | 80             | 82                  | 25              | 67             |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 45              | 55            | 55                 | 55               | 66             | 76                  | 38              | 72             | 88               |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 52              | 62            | 65                 | 67               | 76             | 70                  | 47              | 69             | 90               |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 58              | 68            |                    | 58               | 76             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 74              | 65            | 46                 | 76               | 82             | 77                  | 58              | 86             | 95               |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 48              | 58            | 57                 | 58               | 70             | 74                  | 37              | 69             | 91               |                          |                                |

| 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                                       | 7        | 33     | 33          | 28        | 63      | 52           | 23       | 33      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 31       | 54     | 64          | 47        | 73      | 70           |          | 70      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 100      |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 51     | 49          | 56        | 71      | 69           | 49       | 71      | 96        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 51       | 58     | 57          | 64        | 73      | 65           | 49       | 77      | 83        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 47       | 60     |             | 67        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 67       | 60     |             | 81        | 76      |              | 69       | 88      | 93        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 43       | 53     | 52          | 58        | 71      | 66           | 47       | 72      | 95        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 7        | 34     | 38          | 28        | 53      | 55           | 17       | 47      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 43       | 54     | 50          | 41        | 63      | 60           | 20       | 50      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 91       | 64     |             | 100       | 100     |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 42     | 34          | 53        | 60      | 54           | 38       | 71      | 100       |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 52       | 56     | 51          | 58        | 66      | 60           | 53       | 76      | 92        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       | 50     |             | 56        | 69      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 66     |             | 87        | 76      | 73           | 67       | 91      | 95        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 42       | 46     | 39          | 55        | 64      | 57           | 42       | 70      | 96        |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data**

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 65   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 62   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 650  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 39   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 58  |
| 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   |     |
| 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                                | 61  |
| 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  | 66  |
| 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   | 65  |
| 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   | 73  |
| 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                                | 61 |
| 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.

ESSA subgroup ESE (ELA) 39%. Reading levels(students are in the phase of learning to read instead of reading to learn), learned self-helplessness. Teacher need to differentiate the instruction (literacy strategies) in order to increase student engagement.

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

Science (from 52% to 43%). Movement of STEP UP students (missing 7th grade science skills), Reading ability of students impacts their ability to understand the text of the test. Teacher need to focus on critical thinking skills.

#### 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.

6th grade math (Ferrell 48% , State 55% -7% difference). Students coming to us without basic skills (multiplication, addition, subtraction, division). Much time is needed to reteach what they did not learn in elementary. Teacher need more support in differentiating instruction.

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

ELA achievement level up by 5%, ELA learning gains up by 5% and up by 6% with BQ in ELA. BQ in math was up 9%. Focused on school-wide literacy strategies of RARE, and introduction to DI. Targeted support for BQ in math at all 3 grade leves (intensive math class and pull out support from 8 period model).

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

The number of student that increase from 6th to 7th grade with 2 or more indicators (6th - 8, 7th - 38, 8th - 32).

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

1. Increase teacher understanding, planning and implementation of ELA standards and literacy strategies using DI.
2. Increase teacher understanding of student data in order to plan and implement differentiated and engaging lessons.
- 3.

- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | <p>We will continue to develop our culture for learning by focusing on the academic engagement of our students. Teachers will plan, implement and assess standards-aligned instruction that engage students. Teachers will use differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students.</p> <p>Our students will become more engaged in rigorous, academically focused and collaborative learning, positively impacting achievement.</p>   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | <p>If we effectively implement high leverage-strategies which support standards-based instruction, then percent of students achieving proficiency in: ELA will increase from 53% to 56%, Math will increase from 62% to 65%, Civics will increase from 75% to 78%, SSA will increase from 43% to 46%,and MS Acceleration 92% to 95%.</p> <p>If we effectively implement high leverage-strategies which support standards-based instruction, then percent of students achieving learninggains in: ELA will increase from 60% to 63%, ELA BQ will increase from 58% to 61%, Math will increase from 72% to 75%, and Math BQ will increase 75% to 78%.</p>           |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | <p>Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)</p>   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use HOTS (ACE) &amp; RICER learner attributes</li> <li>2. Use of Kagan collaborative structures and targeted literacy skills</li> <li>3. Supported lesson planning with focus on differentiated instruction with Achieve 3000.</li> </ol> <p>HOTS - Higher-orderthinking skills put advanced cognitive demand on students. Higher-order questions promote critical thinking skills because these types of questions expect students to apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information instead of simply recalling facts. RICER Learner Attributes are foundational skills to Cambridge International Schools.</p> |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <p>Collaborative structures (Kagan) are instructional strategies designed to promote cooperation, communication and authentic discussion in the classroom, boost students' confidence and retain their interest in classroom interaction. Academic Moves teaches students essential skills (reading, writing, and problem solving skills) needed for mastering the ELA FL Standards.</p> <p>Supporting lesson planning through PLCs, with coach support, will ensure alignment to the rigor of the standards and incorporation of appropriate collaborative strategies.</p>   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide PD for teachers in HOTS (ACE) & RICER learner attributes aligned to standards based instruction.
2. Implement Kagan-based strategies in all content areas This will be done by incorporating "make and take" PD opportunities into faculty mtgs/PLCs once a quarter to support collaborative strategies for classroom use.
3. Bi-weekly walk-throughs by leadership team to monitor use of HOTS and collaborative structures as well as implementation of lessons aligned to the rigor of the standards.
4. LA, Rdg, SS, and Science will incorporate Achieve 3000 to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of the students.

**Person Responsible** Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | We will target our under-performing subgroup (SWD) with extended learning opportunities and best-practices strategies.<br><br>Rationale Our SWD will be given extended learning opportunities through RtI Tier 2 & 3 support with the very best teaching strategies. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | If we effectively implement differentiated extended learning opportunities which support standards-based instruction for SWD, then percent of SWD meeting the ESSA Federal Index requirement will increase from 39% to 41%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | 1. Extended learning opportunities<br>2. Best teaching strategies to support a Strong Tier 1<br>3. Monitor RtI/MTSS Tier 2 and 3 with implementation for fidelity.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Response to intervention (RtI) has one the highest effect sizes, as reported in "Visible Learning". Extended learning opportunities (time) is also indicated as a positive intervention.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide PD for teacher regarding teaching best practices for Inclusion.
2. Target SWD for push-in tutoring by ESE teachers and RtI Coach
3. Provide Learning Strategies class to allow for targeted students additional support and extended time support.
4. RtI to monitor Tier 2 and 3 interventions to ensure that they are a supplement to Tier 1 instruction.
5. IEP goals will be monitored by case manager on a quarterly basis in conjunction with Quarterly Report Cards.
6. Achieve 3000 (literacy) and Moby Max (math) will be used to for added practice and progress monitoring of the students.

**Person Responsible** Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

1. **Student Success Coach and RtI Coach will strategically monitor and support students EWS.**
2. **School Wide use of Canvas and streamlined technology supports will be used by all faculty to increase students ability to function independently and proactively.**

**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.

We work to communicate every students' progress to the parents/guardians by sending home bi-weekly progress reports and holding quarterly Student Led Conferences. School staff, students, parents and the community work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. Our goal is build positive relationships with families. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by communicating through ParentLink, Canvas, school website. We facilitate annual Mother Daughter Day Event and Father

Daughter Dance in order to provide unique families experiences on our school campus. We have a success coach that works with both students and parents on having a successfu ltransition to middle and high school.

Examples of Events: Open House, Hispanic Heritage Month Saturday School Celebration,SAC Mtgs, Parent Link, Conference Nights, Volunteer Orientation/Recognition, Great American Teach-In, , Parent Workshop:Transition to Middle School, Cyber-bullying.

**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: Standards-aligned Instruction |  |                 |     | \$243,780.00 |
|---|----------|---|--|-----------------|-----|--------------|
|   | Function | Object  | Budget Focus   | Funding Source  | FTE | 2020-21      |
|   | 5100     | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel                           | 3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School  | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | \$95,000.00  |
|   |          |   | <i>Notes: Success Coach: works with 100 students (EWS of 2 or more indicators) and Step Up students. Works with parents to increase family involvement and student support. Facilitate school wide SEL initiative</i>  |                 |     |              |
|   | 5100     | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel                           | 3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School  | Title, I Part A | 0.5 | \$47,500.00  |
|   |          |   | <i>Notes: Reading Coach - Provide support, mentoring, and assistance within school. Serve a resource for identification of instructional strategies and materials among all subjects and interventions to address diverse learning needs. Co-teach and conduct demonstration lessons. Assist teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing instruction. Collaborate with teacher teams/depts to improve instruction and solve problems that limit student achievement. Observe instruction and provide feedback.</i> |                 |     |              |

|          |               |  |  |                 |               |                     |
|----------|---------------|--|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|
|          | 5100          | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel                      | 3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School  | Title, I Part A | 0.5           | \$47,500.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Math Resource Teacher - Provide support, mentoring, and assistance within school. Serve a resource for identification of instructional strategies and materials and interventions to address diverse learning needs. Co-teach and conduct demonstration lessons. Assist teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing instruction. Collaborate with teacher teams/depts to improve instruction and solve problems that limit student achievement. Observe instruction and provide feedback. Conduct small group tutoring of targeted groups of students.</i> |                 |               |                     |
|          | 5100          | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel                      | 3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School  | Title, I Part A | 0.5           | \$47,500.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Rtl Coach - Provide support, mentoring, and assistance within school. Serve as a resource for differentiating instruction at all tier levels. Provide training for DI.. Assist teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing instruction. Collaborate with teacher teams/depts to improve instruction and solve problems that limit student achievement. Lead MTSS team in examining data and building support plans. Pull and examine data. Weekly progress monitoring to determine need for more interventions. PD in the use of data.</i>                 |                 |               |                     |
|          | 5100          | 369-Technology-Related Rentals                                   | 3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School  | Title, I Part A | 0.0           | \$6,280.00          |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Moby Max - Use software to help help progress monitor students and differentiate instruction. Students will use this in Lang Arts, Math, and Reading weekly Pear Deck - Use software to help help progress monitor students and differentiate instruction. Pear Deck will be used ALL teachers and students to building daily/weekly formative assessments. USA Test Prep -Use software to help help progress monitor students and differenitate instruction. This will be used in all Civics classes an additional resource for teachers and students.</i>    |                 |               |                     |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b> |  |                 |               | <b>\$0.00</b>       |
|          |               |  |  |                 | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$243,780.00</b> |