Madison Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Madison Middle School

4444 W BAY VISTA AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David Parker

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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.

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

Madison Middle School

4444 W BAY VISTA AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[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	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

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

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
Brown, Joseph	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, David Parker

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.*
4

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	211	221	211	0	0	0	0	643
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	29	15	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
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	45	55	47	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	60	48	0	0	0	0	166

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	2	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

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	219	189	189	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	33	47	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	25	36	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	31	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	62	80	0	0	0	0	218

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	23	20	19	0	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	219	189	189	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	33	47	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	25	36	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	31	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	62	80	0	0	0	0	218

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	23	20	19	0	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	46%	51%	54%	42%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	52%	54%	47%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	47%	47%	34%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	51%	55%	58%	46%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	56%	57%	57%	55%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	51%	33%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	37%	47%	51%	45%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	67%	72%	54%	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	47%	53%	-6%	54%	-7%
	2018	43%	52%	-9%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	54%	-9%	52%	-7%
	2018	30%	52%	-22%	51%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	37%	53%	-16%	56%	-19%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	58%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	62%	-10%	54%	-2%
	2018	37%	61%	-24%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	26%	31%	-5%	46%	-20%
	2018	15%	29%	-14%	45%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	35%	47%	-12%	48%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	50%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	52%	67%	-15%	71%	-19%
2018	48%	65%	-17%	71%	-23%
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	89%	63%	26%	61%	28%
2018	83%	63%	20%	62%	21%
Compare		6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	37	33	15	29	23	8	20			
ELL	18	38	38	24	43	36	17	31			
ASN	79	79		88	83						

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
BLK	27	41	36	32	46	46	18	44			
HSP	39	46	31	45	53	39	28	55	76		
MUL	60	56		64	48						
WHT	66	63	59	70	66	47	61	69	92		
FRL	38	46	37	42	49	42	28	53	72		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	47	45	25	44	47	21	35			
ELL	18	51	66	19	52	63	27	30			
ASN	60	61		75	61						
BLK	28	35	26	28	47	43	14	41			
HSP	36	49	55	37	52	53	32	46	73		
MUL	63	63		67	75						
WHT	62	62	91	72	72	64	63	82	97		
FRL	36	47	45	38	54	51	27	49	73		

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	10	28	27	15	35	29	10	33			
ELL	17	41	39	15	38	32	13	43			
ASN	67	60		87	80						
BLK	22	33	24	17	40	31	28	38			
HSP	34	45	41	40	51	38	33	44	93		
MUL	50	45		71	70						
WHT	69	61	42	71	67		75	79	88		
FRL	35	42	34	37	49	35	36	46	90		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	82
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	57
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	
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	66
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	46
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.

As we did not test in the Spring of 2020, I will have to reflect on the 2019 data.
We made gains in every scoring category except for gains in the bottoms quartile for both math and ELA. Both of these were taught by substandard teachers who were not with us during the 2019-2020 school year.

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

Same as above

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.

same as above

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

Based on 2019 data, we saw gains in all areas except for BQ gains. We saw nice gains in proficiency in both ELA and Math

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

The number of students below proficiency in ELA and Math

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

1. Increase achievement of Bottom Quartile in ELA
2. Increase achievement of Bottom Quartile in Math
3. Increase Proficiency in Civics
4. Increase Proficiency in Science
5. Increase proficiency in Reading

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Focus on the BQ in Reading is hampered by the turnover in the Int. Reading instructor. The pool of candidates is not deep. Our reading coach will have to work closely with the new teacher, supporting her instruction. We will also work to improve to reading instruction in all content areas. The inclusion of Achieve 3000 will be an asset in this regard. Our work will also focus on improving the proficiency rate of the following sub-groups: African American, ELL and SWD. The ELL students will have a new model of English and Reading instruction, in which they will be ina specific reading class, in lieu of an ELL reading class. The plan is that this change will result in a more rigorous atmosphere for the ELL students. The SWD will be served in the most rigorous classes afforded by their IEP. By being in a traditional classes, students will not have the stigma of the ESE label. We have created a system of support for the ESE students, using both a co-teach, support facilitation and academic support models. The African American students will continue to be challenged in the classroom. We have removed regular level of instruction. The mindset is that if we want students to perform at higher levels we must teach at higher levels. This model has been shown to be effective based on the past couple years of FSA achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Through the use of monthly formative data provided by BrightFish and Achieve 3000, we will see growth for 85% of our students. Based on the 2021 FSA ELA, we will have 50% of our students scoring in the proficient range.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Brown (joseph.brown@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Achieve 3000 Bright Fish
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	District adoption of Achieve 3000, which has shown success in other schools and districts

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.

The School Leadership team will actively monitor student progress across content area. As the Area of Focus is on the BQ, we will also be sensitive to the entire student population in regards to progress. We will use data from on-going formative assessments, which will also include semester exams.

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.

The school is organized by grade level teams. Each team has incentives based on attendance, behavior, achievement. In addition, the school as a school-wide PBIS using Mustangs Bucks. Students earn Bucks for doing the right thing, making the honor roll, etc.. These bucks can then be spent at the Stampede Store for a variety of items.

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: ELA				$169,577.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	2651 - Madison Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$88,927.00
			Notes: Reading Coach			
		100-Salaries	2651 - Madison Middle School	Title, I Part A		$67,450.00
			Notes: Student Success Coach			
		612-Library Books for Existing Libraries	2651 - Madison Middle School	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00

		341000-SUPPLIES - GENERAL	2651 - Madison Middle School	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
	6150	341000-SUPPLIES - GENERAL	2651 - Madison Middle School	Title, I Part A		$1,200.00
					Total:	**$169,577.00**