

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Liberty Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Liberty Middle School

17400 COMMERCE PARK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Frank Diaz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2010

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 83% |
| 2020-21 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 (64%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (64%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Liberty Middle School

17400 COMMERCE PARK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>55%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>77%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Year | | | | |
| Grade | | 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.

Liberty Middle School's mission is to provide a safe, caring, yet Motivating, learning environment. The faculty and staff are dedicated to the task of assisting students with achieving Academic excellence through Rigorous and challenging learning curriculum. Through these means we will ensure that students are College-ready and have the necessary skills to be successful citizens, ultimately reaching their Highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

M.A.R.C.H. with P.R.I.D.E
(Mission) with Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Dependability, Encouragement

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Ammirati, James | Principal | Oversees all campus requirements. |
| Brown, Angela M | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for Curriculum |
| Enriquez, Rey | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Affairs |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/10/2010, Frank Diaz

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.*

6

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,088

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 323 | 398 | 383 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1104 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 57 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 63 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 73 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 |

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 | 23 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |

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 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 383 | 361 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1084 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 33 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 39 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 58 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 82 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 |

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 | 4 | 27 | 31 | 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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2020-21 - 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 | 383 | 361 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1084 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 33 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 39 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 58 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 82 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 |

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 | 23 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 61% | 51% | 54% | 61% | 52% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 60% | 52% | 54% | 58% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45% | 47% | 47% | 44% | 48% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 67% | 55% | 58% | 67% | 56% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 67% | 57% | 57% | 69% | 59% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52% | 52% | 51% | 62% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 62% | 47% | 51% | 61% | 47% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 72% | 67% | 72% | 72% | 66% | 72% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 53% | 2% | 54% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 54% | 4% | 52% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 53% | 7% | 56% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 49% | 6% | 55% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 69% | 62% | 7% | 54% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 23% | 31% | -8% | 46% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 47% | 11% | 48% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 68% | 67% | 1% | 71% | -3% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 91% | 63% | 28% | 61% | 30% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 57% | 43% | 57% | 43% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Power BI Report 2020-2021 Data - Math, All grade levels
 Achieve3000- ELA (Pulled on IPT)

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 62 | 67 | 70 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 55.90 | 64.05 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43.50 | 46.69 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 80.10 | 73.09 | |
| | English Language Learners | 26.75 | 33.99 | |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 58 | 58 | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 72.30 | 56.33 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 64 | 56.83 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 81.30 | 78.59 | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | 48.70 | 50.64 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40.70 | 37.50 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 63 | 73.75 | |
| | English Language Learners | 22 | 17.37 | |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 57 | 59 | 60 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 52.80 | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52.80 | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 52.80 | 46.15 | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 60.20 | 58.41 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39.30 | 46.79 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 88.50 | 77.24 | |
| | English Language Learners | 15.10 | 22.22 | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 17 | 23 | 19 | 22 | 34 | 30 | 25 | 30 | 75 | | |
| ELL | 33 | 42 | 32 | 40 | 41 | 31 | 29 | 54 | 64 | | |
| ASN | 80 | 80 | 45 | 83 | 71 | | 76 | 90 | 94 | | |
| BLK | 33 | 34 | 19 | 33 | 35 | 35 | 38 | 47 | 58 | | |
| HSP | 43 | 44 | 31 | 44 | 40 | 33 | 43 | 54 | 76 | | |
| MUL | 56 | 40 | | 58 | 44 | 30 | 46 | 57 | 71 | | |
| WHT | 71 | 66 | 48 | 74 | 59 | 50 | 75 | 81 | 88 | | |
| FRL | 35 | 38 | 26 | 39 | 41 | 36 | 37 | 51 | 63 | | |
| 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 | 24 | 41 | 42 | 34 | 47 | 39 | 24 | 38 | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 44 | 33 | 40 | 59 | 52 | 20 | 34 | 92 | | |

| 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 | 82 | 73 | 58 | 90 | 77 | | 97 | 86 | 97 | | |
| BLK | 46 | 53 | 51 | 51 | 63 | 56 | 47 | 59 | 84 | | |
| HSP | 47 | 51 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 50 | 45 | 59 | 87 | | |
| MUL | 66 | 68 | 42 | 72 | 69 | 60 | 65 | 83 | 81 | | |
| WHT | 76 | 66 | 44 | 80 | 72 | 53 | 77 | 88 | 84 | | |
| FRL | 46 | 52 | 45 | 52 | 59 | 50 | 47 | 60 | 82 | | |
| 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 | 28 | 38 | 33 | 34 | 54 | 47 | 26 | 50 | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 43 | 40 | 38 | 63 | 63 | 24 | 31 | 67 | | |
| ASN | 84 | 76 | 40 | 89 | 86 | 80 | 93 | 89 | 100 | | |
| BLK | 45 | 53 | 48 | 53 | 69 | 68 | 44 | 68 | 76 | | |
| HSP | 49 | 53 | 39 | 52 | 62 | 59 | 55 | 57 | 80 | | |
| MUL | 65 | 51 | | 63 | 72 | 69 | 73 | 78 | 82 | | |
| WHT | 74 | 62 | 51 | 83 | 70 | 52 | 67 | 81 | 87 | | |
| FRL | 47 | 52 | 42 | 54 | 63 | 63 | 45 | 62 | 75 | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 24 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 499 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 92% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 39 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 77 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 37 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 43 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 50 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 68 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 39 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Grade Levels:

- ELA Achieve3000 data shows an increase for all three grade levels from Fall to Spring.

Subgroups:

- SWD Math data decreased in 6th and 7th grade from Fall to Winter, Data was missing to show growth pattern in Spring.
- ED 7th grade students data dropped in Civics and Math from Fall to Winter, Data was missing to show growth pattern in Spring.

Core Content Areas:

- Overall 2% decrease in proficiency in 8th Grade Science. ED and ELL made gains from Fall to Winter.
- ELA Achieve3000 data shows an increase for all three grade levels from Fall to Spring.
- 6th: 8% gains 7th: 3% gains 8th: 3% gains
- Overall 2% increase in proficiency in 7th Grade Civics. SWD made 10% proficiency gains from Fall to Winter.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Greatest Need for Improvement:

- ELL data reports back significantly lower data in comparison than other subgroups in similar content areas. Under 25% in Math, Science, and Civics. ELA data was not available for this subgroup to compare.

This is similar to our 2019 report of students in our Lowest 25 Percentile group (a portion of our ELL students) for math showing the greatest decline from the prior year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing Factors:

- Language Barrier
- Lack of consistent attendance due to the pandemic.
- New mode of learning for students: eLearning
- Adapting methods of instruction for teachers.
- Disruption in consistent instruction from one instructor due to losing units throughout the year and schedules having to be revised.

Actions:

- Consistency in modes of learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA have increased in Learning Gains according to data pulled from Achieve3000.

Based off the 2019 state assessment, Geometry ECO students show a positive gap of +43% compared to the state average.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA factors that attribute to this has been:

- Implementing standard-base planning school-wide through PLCs with content area teachers.
- Weekly rotations across grade level using platform.
- Instant data for teachers to use to provide feedback and create lesson plans.

Math factors that attribute to this has been:

- Accelerated program beginning in 6th grade.
- Students are blocked together and have the same teacher for Algebra and Geometry. Whereas, our 8th grade math students show a negative -23% gap in comparison to the state average.
- All level 3 and above students are automatically placed in Algebra. This is not the same in all schools across the state.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

- Explicit Instruction with Scaffolds
- Small Group Instruction based on Student Data
- Common Planning / PLC Cycles

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

- Calibration on Grading ELA Essays for Writing Portion of FSA
- Planning for Small Group Instruction
- AVID: Collaborative Study Groups in Content Areas and Cognitive Organization by Discipline

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

SLT and ILT will conduct monthly walk-throughs throughout the year to assess explicit instruction and provide professional development opportunities as needed based on walk-through data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: At Liberty, teachers will work collectively in professional learning communities to identify and address unfinished student learning. We will institute the inquiry cycle of data-driven instruction, including assessment, analysis, and action to accelerate student learning.

Measurable Outcome: Students will show increase in content assessments during progress monitoring in each learning cycle.

Monitoring: Teachers will share student data and plan during PLCs every Tuesday and which is facilitated and monitored by the SAL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: James Ammirati (james.ammirati@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: common interim assessment data: monitors growth and achievement according to specific learning goals and academic standards.

guided discourse: directs and guides the students in a classroom talk on a specific problem

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The effectiveness of collective teacher efficacy has been validated repeatedly by research involving general education and special education students. (John Hattie) Albert Bandura defines collective efficacy as “a group’s shared belief in the conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment.”

Action Steps to Implement

- Teachers will:
- Analyze common interim assessment data
 - Identify standards needing further action
 - Review targeted skills and concepts by modeling or guided discourse
 - Reassess

Person Responsible James Ammirati (james.ammirati@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | At Liberty, students will have the opportunity to actively participate in teacher-led small group instruction and cooperative learning following whole group instruction to reinforce skills and concepts. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Teachers will work with smaller groups of students to increase student's understanding of instructional concepts. |
| Monitoring: | Teachers will share student data during weekly check-ins with SAL and plan according to the needs of students. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Angela M Brown (angelam.brown@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Check for understanding · Scaffold and differentiate instruction · Accelerate students to finish their learning · Conduct data chats · Present a targeted task for evidence of learning or discover misconceptions |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Learning science research has shown that small-group learning (when compared to competitive and individualistic learning) improves academic achievement, relationships with classmates and faculty, and promotes psychological well-being. The following summarizes these benefits, drawn from a meta-analysis of small-group learning in The Journal on Excellence in College Teaching (Johnson et. al., 2014). |

Action Steps to Implement

- Teachers will:
- Informally assess students during instruction
 - Teachers will collect and share student data during weekly PLCs
- Person Responsible** James Ammirati (james.ammirati@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Liberty Middle School is a community of learners as we are all here to learn and grow together. At Liberty, all staff will encourage and reward positive student behavior with a school-wide incentive program based on the following expectations for students:
 As a Liberty Middle School student, I will embrace the core values of PRIDE.
 · I will persevere: I will do the hard work it takes to be successful.
 · I will be respectful: I will honor all people and their ideas.
 · I will show integrity: I will be trustworthy, honest, and kind.
 · I will be dependable: I will honor my commitments and be reliable.
 · I will encourage others: I will be caring, sympathetic, and helpful.

Measurable Outcome: We will “catch students being good” and reinforce the positive behaviors through a school-wide positive behavior incentive program. As a school, overall internal and external suspensions will decrease as a result of the behavior program.

Monitoring: To clarify the expectations in action, we will define guidelines for different school settings and routines. Teachers and staff members will “catch students being good” and reinforce the positive behaviors they see. Liberty Middle School staff will award students with “Liberty Bucks” to use to purchase supplies, spirit items, snacks, and special privileges.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Megan Boghosian (megan.boghosian@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Liberty Bucks to spend at school store once a month during lunch periods.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed. (<https://www.pbis.org/>)

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will:
 - Observe student behavior on a daily basis.
 - Pass out Liberty Bucks to students who are meeting the PRIDE expectations.

Person Responsible Megan Boghosian (megan.boghosian@hcps.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: The subgroup, Students With Disabilities, has scored below the proficiency level of 41%. According to the data provided, our school is below the Federal Index, scoring at 34%.

Measurable Outcome: At Liberty, SWD data will reflect a proficiency increase by 3%.

Monitoring: ESE Specialist will meet with ESE Teachers bi-weekly to monitor the effectiveness of IEPs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Escobar (jennifer.escobar@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Instructional Supports:

- ESE Teachers will work alongside Gen ED teachers to modify curriculum to meet IEP expectations.
- Small Group sessions will be planned to reteach concepts assessed during common assessments.
- Case Managers will update IEPs on a timely manner to reflect most accurate support systems of success.
- Common Planning (PLCs) will be scheduled for Gen Ed Teachers and ESE Teachers.
- Professional Development opportunities will be made available to support the needs of Gen Ed Teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Best Practices shows that ESE Teachers and Gen Ed Teachers should plan lessons with specific modifications as needed with the best interest of SWD in mind. Teachers also need an opportunity to learn current and innovative strategies that works best for SWD.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Update IEPs
2. Inform teachers of SWD on rosters and Case Manager.
3. Provide Common Planning for ESE / Gen Ed Teachers
4. Provide LRE space for small group sessions
5. Provide PD opportunities for Gen Ed Teachers that reflect current strategies that supports the learning of SWD

Person Responsible Jennifer Escobar (jennifer.escobar@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When compared to other discipline data reported by the state, Liberty Middle is in the exceptionally low category reporting 1.3 incidents per 100 students, ranking 85th out of 553 middle schools in the state, and 5th in Hillsborough County out of 46. Our primary area of concern that we will focus on monitoring will be the level of violent incidents that could potentially occur. We will continue to implement our PBIS system, monitoring and rewarding positive behaviors, with the belief that students will adapt to positive behaviors to increase their opportunities to participate in incentives on campus.

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.

Liberty Middle School will be building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved in all aspects of planning, implementing, and readdressing student success and creating opportunities for success.

- PTSA
- SAC
- Sunshine Committee
- Student Council
- Student Clubs
- PRIDE Club
- Common Planning Time
- Instructional Leadership Teams

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers:

- Pre-Planning Introduction to who represents Liberty Middle School.
- Updating staff's knowledge of Student Data and Demographics, Positive Cultural Ed-Camp Rotations.
- Starting a Cultural Committee that meets once a month to participate in a book study, Lead with Culture by Jay Billy, as part of a Professional Development opportunity.

-Cultural Committee will introduce monthly strategies for staff to use in their classrooms to continue building positive environment.

Students:

- Celebrate and display national heritages that represent the diverse cultures on campus.
- Offer monthly 'Student Forums' that provides students a platform to share interest, address school concerns or provide community outreach.

Parents:

- Student of the Month Family Celebrations
- Positive Notes Home
- Positive Phone Calls

Community Stakeholders:

- Add members to SAC, PTSA
- Allow community businesses to participate as vendors to offer their services to our families

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |