# Ferrell Middle Magnet School

**2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Ferrell Middle Magnet School

## 4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

### [ no web address on file ]

**Demographics**

## Principal: Cara Diehl

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (65%)<br><br>2017-18: A (64%)<br><br>2016-17: B (60%) |
| **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

## Ferrell Middle Magnet School

### 4302 N 24TH 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) |
|---|---|---|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 79% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 86% |

### School Grades History

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

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

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

Developing confident, dynamic, educated young women.

### School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| French, Karen | Principal | Oversees all functions of the school |
| Cason, Shayla | SAC Member | Student Success Coach<br>SAC Chair |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Saturday 7/10/2021, Cara Diehl

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
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.*
7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
28

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
453

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**
1

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
0

### 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 | 126 | 154 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 446 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

#### 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 | 21 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/10/2021

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

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

## 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 | | | | 53% | 51% | 54% | 48% | 52% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 60% | 52% | 54% | 55% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 58% | 47% | 47% | 52% | 48% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 62% | 55% | 58% | 63% | 56% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 72% | 57% | 57% | 73% | 59% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 75% | 52% | 51% | 66% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 43% | 47% | 51% | 52% | 47% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 75% | 67% | 72% | 75% | 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 | 51% | 53% | -2% | 54% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 54% | 0% | 52% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 53% | 1% | 56% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 49% | -1% | 55% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 65% | 62% | 3% | 54% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -48% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 31% | 13% | 46% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 47% | -4% | 48% | -5% |
| 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 | 75% | 67% | 8% | 71% | 4% |
| 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 | 92% | 63% | 29% | 61% | 31% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 90% | 57% | 33% | 57% | 33% |

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

ELA (6-8) Achieve3000 Baseline, Mid-Year, and Summative Data (% Meets/Exceeds Standards)
Math, Science & Civics Baseline & Mid-Year HCPS assessments (average % correct), Spring Data FSA, SSA, EOC Results

| Grade 6 | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **English Language Arts** | All Students | 17 | 23 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17 | 23 | 50 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 40 | 43 | 46 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **Mathematics** | All Students | 32 | 34 | 36 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 44 | 32 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23 | 43 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | 44 | 25 |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22 | 28 | 31 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22 | 28 | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32 | 34 | 34 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 29 | 41 | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 41 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 31 | 43 | 26 |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | 38 | n/a |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 30 | 44 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30 | 44 | 63 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29 | 43 | 31 |
| | English Language Learners | 27 | 24 | n/a |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22 | 31 | 37 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22 | 33 | 37 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 33 | 36 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28 | 52 | 57 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | 52 | 54 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32 | 51 | 23 |
| | English Language Learners | 12 | 47 | n/a |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 36 | 39 | 32 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 32 | 39 | 28 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 43 | 29 | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | 2 | 6 | n/a |

## 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 | 11 | 25 | 30 | 13 | 30 | 26 | 14 | 28 | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 49 | 48 | 37 | 44 | 43 | 21 | 48 | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 42 | 38 | 35 | 50 | 49 | 23 | 55 | 65 | | |
| HSP | 57 | 55 | 49 | 53 | 50 | 36 | 36 | 67 | 75 | | |
| MUL | 59 | 59 | | 68 | 72 | | 27 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 65 | | 67 | 48 | | 67 | 84 | 95 | | |
| FRL | 48 | 49 | 43 | 43 | 51 | 48 | 28 | 60 | 70 | | |
| 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 | 44 | 47 | 28 | 58 | 74 | 12 | 32 | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 55 | 59 | 58 | 80 | 82 | 25 | 67 | | | |
| BLK | 45 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 66 | 76 | 38 | 72 | 88 | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 52 | 62 | 65 | 67 | 76 | 70 | 47 | 69 | 90 | | |
| MUL | 58 | 68 | | 58 | 76 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | 65 | 46 | 76 | 82 | 77 | 58 | 86 | 95 | | |
| FRL | 48 | 58 | 57 | 58 | 70 | 74 | 37 | 69 | 91 | | |
| **2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 7 | 33 | 33 | 28 | 63 | 52 | 23 | 33 | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 54 | 64 | 47 | 73 | 70 | | 70 | | | |
| ASN | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 51 | 49 | 56 | 71 | 69 | 49 | 71 | 96 | | |
| HSP | 51 | 58 | 57 | 64 | 73 | 65 | 49 | 77 | 83 | | |
| MUL | 47 | 60 | | 67 | 73 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 60 | | 81 | 76 | | 69 | 88 | 93 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 53 | 52 | 58 | 71 | 66 | 47 | 72 | 95 | | |

## 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 | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 458 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 96% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 22 |
| 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 | 42 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 44 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 53 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 71 |
| 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 | 49 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?**

6th Grade historically is making lower gains than 7th and 8th grade in both ELA and Math.

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

ELA Achievement of proficiency
Science achieve of proficiency

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

Teacher need to focus on differentiating instruction to meet the needs of the learners along with challenging them the appropriate level.

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

Learning gains in math for all grade level
Algebra EOC proficiency

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

Targeted skills support, small group support, intensive math support with collaborative planning with teachers.

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

Differentiated support in ELA, small group support in ELA
Reading support in 8th grade science

**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.**

On going training to support differentiated instruction. Monthly PLC focus on HCPS Instructional framework model

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

Use of success coach and magnet lead teacher to support tier interventions and training of teacher in differentiated instruction.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | CNA analysis: Teachers are focused on teaching to the middle instead of planning for differentiation. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | If we effectively progress monitor student learning and plan differentiated instruction that support standards-based instruction then:<br>The percent of students achieving proficiency on<br>• FSA ELA will increase from 51% to 56%,<br>• FSA Math will increase from 47% to 56%<br>• Civics EOC will increase from 63% to 75%<br>• Middle Acceleration will increase from 75% to 90%<br>• SSA will increase from 32 to 45%<br>Student learning gains in:<br>• ELA will increase from 50% to 60%,<br>• Math will increase from 52% to 60%<br>• BQ ELA learning gains will increase from 42% to 55%.<br>• BQ Math learning gains will increase from 46% to 60% |
| **Monitoring:** | Achieve3000 reading data will be monitored on twice a quarter by ILT.<br>Success Coach and Lead Magnet Teacher will facilitate Level 3 interventions (review monthly)<br>Differentiation strategies will implemented per semester by PLCs |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Differentiation |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Differentiated instruction is an approach whereby teachers adjust their curriculum and instruction to maximize the learning of all students: average learners, English language learners, struggling students, students with learning disabilities, and gifted and talented students. Differentiated instruction is not a single strategy but rather a framework that teachers can use to implement a variety of strategies, many of which are evidence-based. These evidence-based strategies include: Employing effective classroom management procedures, Grouping students for instruction (especially students with significant learning problems), Assessing readiness, Teaching to the student's zone of proximal development. (Iris.Peabody.Vanderbilt.edu) |

### Action Steps to Implement

Implement PLC collaborative planning to support progress monitoring of student learning and implementation of differentiated instruction.

Calendar out common assessment in core content in order to drive instruction.

Core content training on HCPS Instructional Frameworks. Focus on small groups. Will monitored in PLCs in monthly basis.

Train and support teachers in developing scaffolding strategies for targeted small group instruction.

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

Bi-Weekly implementation of Newsla reading support in LA/Reading classes. Data will be monitored in PLCs and ILT Monthly

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

Whole-School implementation of ACE writing strategy. All classes will implement ACE response bi-weekly. This will monitored quarterly in faculty mtg student sample reviews.

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

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

**Our discipline data is down slightly from 2018-19 to 2019-20. Student success coach will implement a restorative practices program in the 2122 school year. HCPS discipline will monitored on a quarterly basis by the Adm/Guidance Team.**

## 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.

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

coach that works with both students and parents on having a successful transition to middle and high school.

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

Furthermore being a Cambridge International School, Ferrell implement whole-school Global Perspective Challenges each semester. These challenges will focus on the 5 Cambridge Learner Attributes with a strong focus on collaboration.

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

Students - follow school Creed and HCPS Student Code of Conduct
Staff - follow through with ongoing communication with students and parents/guardians
Parents - actively support students and engage in open communication with staff
Student Success Coach - implement / facilitate Restorative Practices
Magnet Lead teacher - implement / facilitate Global Perspective Challenges

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | $0.00 |
|---|--------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|
|   |        | Total: | $0.00 |