

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Middleton High 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 | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Middleton High School

4801 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Camilla Burton

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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: C (51%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) |
| 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 | 20 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Middleton High School

4801 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | Yes | 63% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 88% |

School Grades History

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

Middleton High School's family will focus combined efforts on becoming lifelong learners. We shall excel academically, become technologically competent, demonstrate appropriate ethical values, and take our place as competitive members of a global community, thus creating a better society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every Middleton High School student will attain his or her highest level of academic success and personal growth.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Boddie, Mickey | Principal | As principal, Mr. Boddie oversees the day to day operations of Middleton High School. He is charged with leading Middleton's students and staff to excellence. |
| Streeter, Karina | Assistant Principal | Ms. Streeter supports the implementation of goals for teachers and students in the ELA department. She is also charges will overseeing the ESE departments. She assists in planning for professional development opportunities in supports of our SIP goals. |
| Heinsen, Robert | Teacher, K-12 | Mr. Heinsen is one of our math teachers. He leads the SAC Committee and helps develop the SIP goals. |
| White, Brustoa | Assistant Principal | Mr. White supports the implementation of goals for teachers and students in the Social Studies department. He assists in planning for professional development opportunities in supports of our SIP goals. |
| Wilhelm, Brittney | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Wilhelm is responsible for all curriculum school-wide. She oversees all programs, schedules, and instruction. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Camilla Burton

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.*

1

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

95

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,513

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

14

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

10

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 433 | 377 | 337 | 366 | 1513 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 132 | 106 | 132 | 473 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 8 | 9 | 42 |
| 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 28 |

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

Saturday 8/7/2021

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 381 | 414 | 355 | 288 | 1438 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 83 | 75 | 61 | 305 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 73 | 66 | 38 | 269 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 130 | 143 | 60 | 410 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 130 | 143 | 60 | 410 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 29 | 121 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 29 | 121 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 92 | 97 | 35 | 289 |

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 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 381 | 414 | 355 | 288 | 1438 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 83 | 75 | 61 | 305 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 73 | 66 | 38 | 269 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 130 | 143 | 60 | 410 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 130 | 143 | 60 | 410 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 29 | 121 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 29 | 121 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 92 | 97 | 35 | 289 |

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 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 | | | | 57% | 56% | 56% | 57% | 54% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 52% | 54% | 51% | 58% | 53% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 25% | 41% | 42% | 38% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 38% | 49% | 51% | 41% | 48% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 42% | 48% | 48% | 51% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34% | 45% | 45% | 51% | 45% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 58% | 69% | 68% | 60% | 65% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 67% | 75% | 73% | 61% | 73% | 71% |

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 |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 55% | 1% | 55% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 53% | -1% | 53% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -56% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 55% | 66% | -11% | 67% | -12% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 62% | 73% | -11% | 70% | -8% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 17% | 63% | -46% | 61% | -44% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 41% | 57% | -16% | 57% | -16% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

All students in Math were provided a baseline assessment in ALG 1 and GEO. The same students take a midyear assessment.

In science Biology students take a baseline assessment and midyear.

In US History students take a baseline and midyear.

In 20-21 our ELA students completed 3 assessments in Achieve 3000.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 39 | 36 | 37 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19 | 19 | 22 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 56 | 51 | 49 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 30 | 36 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | 33 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33 | 39 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 27 | 35 | 0 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 39 | 44 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33 | 36 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 45 | 51 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 30 | 32 | 0 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 52 | 47 | 48 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 23 | 25 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 70 | 63 | 59 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 27 | 30 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | 29 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 30 | 34 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 25 | 30 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 23 | 38 | 0 |
| Biology | Economically Disadvantaged | 25 | 34 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 29 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25 | 54 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25 | 54 | 0 |
| US History | Students With Disabilities | 46 | 53 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25 | 54 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25 | 54 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 46 | 53 | 0 |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 8 | 10 | 10 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25 | 30 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 30 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 24 | 32 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 24 | 27 | 0 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28 | 29 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | 29 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 30 | 25 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 41 | 50 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33 | 42 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 46 | 53 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 18 | 28 | 0 |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 26 | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24 | 28 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 28 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23 | 36 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 37 | 0 | 0 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28 | 29 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | 29 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 32 | 31 | 0 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 23 | 48 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 | 47 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18 | 42 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 13 | 17 | 16 | 8 | 23 | 36 | 19 | 20 | | 80 | 6 |
| ELL | 24 | 24 | 17 | 22 | 18 | 25 | 34 | 43 | | 81 | 46 |
| ASN | 87 | 63 | | 84 | 23 | | 95 | 94 | | 100 | 100 |
| BLK | 22 | 27 | 18 | 9 | 15 | 21 | 23 | 33 | | 83 | 31 |
| HSP | 57 | 49 | 17 | 32 | 28 | 31 | 65 | 76 | | 91 | 68 |

| 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 |
| MUL | 63 | 39 | | 8 | | | 50 | 100 | | 77 | 70 |
| WHT | 83 | 61 | | 62 | 30 | | 94 | 96 | | 94 | 96 |
| FRL | 30 | 31 | 18 | 15 | 18 | 24 | 36 | 46 | | 84 | 41 |
| 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 | 25 | 26 | 20 | 23 | 28 | 31 | 28 | 32 | | 76 | 22 |
| ELL | 23 | 35 | 25 | 26 | 40 | | 30 | 71 | | 75 | 14 |
| ASN | 96 | 81 | | 94 | 62 | | 98 | 100 | | 100 | 92 |
| BLK | 31 | 35 | 24 | 21 | 31 | 32 | 29 | 44 | | 82 | 24 |
| HSP | 55 | 48 | 28 | 37 | 44 | 36 | 60 | 81 | | 85 | 63 |
| MUL | 81 | 67 | | 70 | | | 78 | 91 | | 89 | 63 |
| WHT | 90 | 76 | | 91 | 64 | | 92 | 100 | | 98 | 92 |
| FRL | 36 | 39 | 24 | 24 | 33 | 33 | 36 | 56 | | 84 | 34 |
| 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 | 24 | 39 | 27 | 24 | 50 | 55 | 33 | 35 | | 60 | 15 |
| ELL | 30 | 56 | 55 | 33 | 42 | | 34 | 48 | | 58 | 33 |
| ASN | 96 | 70 | | 100 | 50 | | 93 | 100 | | 94 | 94 |
| BLK | 29 | 45 | 35 | 24 | 40 | 47 | 37 | 34 | | 76 | 24 |
| HSP | 68 | 67 | 47 | 57 | 55 | 64 | 68 | 81 | | 74 | 52 |
| MUL | 72 | 67 | | 50 | | | 60 | 90 | | | |
| WHT | 90 | 68 | | 77 | 67 | | 88 | 97 | | 94 | 92 |
| FRL | 40 | 49 | 37 | 29 | 46 | 49 | 41 | 45 | | 75 | 32 |

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 | 45 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 495 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 81% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 24 |
| 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 | 35 |
| 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 | 81 |
| 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 | 31 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | 77 |
| 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 | 36 |
| 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?

One clear area of focus is helping our Black and Hispanic students with earning Acceleration points at Middleton.

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

Both Math and ELA have lost ground with making gains in the lowest 25th%

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

Stability and teacher retention in order to engender familiarity and comfort for students. Current efforts to provide a stable environment for students are ongoing and the impact of Covid-19 has hurt these efforts.

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

Graduation rate was significantly improved.

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

Most of this improvement can possibly be explained by the lax environment at all schools during the second half of the 2019-2020 school year and the shutdowns. It is impossible to say if that is the only effect, but it is hard to believe that true gains were had during such a time a turmoil. The lifting of state graduation requirements is a more likely reason.

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

One way we are doing this is to be more proactive in making sure that students are given more chances to move up to Honors level classes for those that have come from Middle School with prior year FSA scores of 3+. We see that not grouping those students into a more accelerated path can

hinder their progress as they will be sharing teacher and classroom time with students that may need more remediation before moving on to new material.

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.

Our professional development will focus on helping teachers plan lessons for all levels of students, identifying students with varying needs, and differentiating for those students in the classroom.

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

One way is discussions of data before school years to help set new instructional priorities before preplanning begins. This way each department has a shared goal for the incoming students. It will be needed to also discuss the students picked out for honors level courses so that they are getting the support needed to make the jump up to a more intensive work load.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Middleton has identified that our lowest quartile in both Math and English are not making adequate gains. This includes, but is not exclusive to, the 4 ESSA Subgroups (African American, Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners) that are marked for improvement by the data. Middleton will strengthen the process for identifying and progress monitoring struggling students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase lower quartile learning gains in Math and ELA by 5%.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be tracked through a combination of baseline assessments and standards based summative assessments throughout the year. Data will be analyzed for each student so that if extra assistance is needed, it is readily available to students who require it.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mickey Boddie (mickey.boddie@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Middleton will restructure Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT) and Response to Intervention (RTI) groups to identify and progress monitor struggling students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These groups will collaborate to provide timely support for our students. Appropriately used support from PLC, ILT and RTI will identify students in our lowest quartile.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use Instructional leadership Team (ILT) to identify gaps in student achievement.
2. Use Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to disaggregate student data in each content area.
3. Utilize Response to Intervention (RTI) to support students with tiered interventions.
4. Conduct data chats to increase student awareness of academic performance.
5. Utilize our Success Coach to progress monitor 9th grade students in the lower quartile to support the transition to high school.
6. Utilize the Magnet Lead Teacher to identify struggling magnet students and develop instructional support plans.
7. Utilize Department Heads and teachers to identify incoming students that can be placed on an accelerated path.

Person Responsible: Mickey Boddie (mickey.boddie@hcps.net)

Post-Secondary Readiness

Provide all students enrolled in Agriculture, Biotechnology, Game Design, TV production, Digital Design, Customer Service, CSIT, ROTC, and Engineering with the opportunity to take a variety of certification exams. These exams will prepare our students to be competitive in their fields.

We have increased our Dual Enrollment and AP offerings to ensure that our students are exposed to rigorous curriculum on the college level.

Person Responsible: Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Strategically implement cross-curricular literacy strategies to increase lower quartile gains.

Measurable Outcome:

Middleton will increase lower quartile learning gains in ELA by 5%.

Monitoring:

This Area of Focus will be tracked through a combination of baseline assessments and standards based summative assessments throughout the year. Data will be analyzed for each student so that if extra assistance is needed, it is readily available to students who require it.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mickey Boddie (mickey.boddie@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Implement literacy instruction across all content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Implementing school-wide literacy strategies will increase student literacy and academic vocabulary skills. Literacy is a key predictor of future success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize our Reading Coach as a Literacy expert for all teachers.
2. Develop and use school-wide literacy strategies.
3. Utilize Teacher Talent Developers (TTD) to engage teachers in use of data to develop instructional strategies and best practices to support diverse learners.
4. Utilize Math Coach to continue to support engaging math instruction for our lower quartile learners.
5. Create comprehensive professional development plan that supports literacy instruction.

Person Responsible

Mickey Boddie (mickey.boddie@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.

Middleton High School ranks # 444 out of 505 among the schools in Florida for School Safety.

This rating includes 5.8 incidents reported per 100 students. When compared to others in the state, Middleton's School Incident Ranking is Very High. This includes 4.17 Violent Incidents, .33 Property Incidents, and 1.30 Drug/Public Order Incidents per 100 students. While these numbers are down from our prior years, it shows great concern when compared to other schools.

Middleton administration is working collaboratively with the our district partners to ensure that we support our students. We have implemented a CCEIS (Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services) Team to help monitor and provide support to students with regards to behavior. This team includes the school psychologist, social workers, guidance counselors, administration, and success coaches to intervene when an issue may arise. Students are followed closed and supported with building relationships with teachers and other faculty members when they are in need.

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.

Middleton High School will engage all stakeholders in the support of our students. We will reach out to our Alumni, PTSA, STEM Advisory Board, and other community partners to collaborate with school staff on improving school culture. We will foster positive relationships with out community partners through mentoring, tutoring, and mentoring opportunities. We will use Canvas, ParentLink, Twitter, The Sentinal, and our school website to communicate with stakeholders on ways to become involved and continue to support Middleton students.

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

Our Parents, PTSA, STEM Advisory Board, and other community partners are all stakeholders in the wellbeing in Middleton High School and its students.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |