Coleman Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Coleman Middle School

1724 S MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (74%) 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Coleman Middle School

1724 S MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	17%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

To provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pritchard, Odalys	Principal	
Seits, Theresa	Assistant Principal	
Chisholm, Robert	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Anthony Jones

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
59

Total number of students enrolled at the school
992

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	329	311	353	0	0	0	0	993
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	26	31	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	24	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	29	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	19	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	47	46	0	0	0	0	130

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	4	0	0	0	0	6

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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	316	350	368	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	13	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	15	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	19	20	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	7	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	316	350	368	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	13	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	15	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	19	20	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	7	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%	50%	50%				82%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						66%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						56%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	85%	36%	36%				87%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	77%						74%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						67%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	52%	53%				71%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	89%	58%	58%				91%	67%	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	2022					
	2019	81%	53%	28%	54%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	52%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2022					
	2019	81%	53%	28%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	82%	49%	33%	55%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	89%	62%	27%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
08	2022					
	2019	55%	31%	24%	46%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	71%	47%	24%	48%	23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	91%	67%	24%	71%	20%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	43	48	42	52	58	51	30	61			
ELL	58	42	38	67	58	55	46	67			
ASN	79	67		90	91		90	90	100		
BLK	38	39	29	46	63	58	43	83			
HSP	65	48	34	72	65	51	67	71	88		
MUL	65	57	50	74	72		64	79	90		
WHT	81	62	50	90	79	76	81	94	96		
FRL	54	48	39	61	58	55	51	74	80		
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	39	39	42	46	53	47	19	82			
ELL	64	72	63	64	67	64	44	75	82		
ASN	86	63		94	81		64		100		
BLK	50	55	54	56	62	71		67			
HSP	68	63	53	78	76	68	63	89	87		
MUL	80	68	50	85	73	60	77	90	93		
WHT	83	61	55	87	78	65	76	94	91		
FRL	68	56	51	73	66	55	63	83	74		
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	44	42	33	48	49	56	41	54	69		
ELL	43	62	58	54	56	42					
ASN	88	58		97	82		67	73	100		
BLK	64	58		75	74	80	30				
HSP	70	60	56	76	66	59	64	86	82		
MUL	80	63	67	84	76		85	84	100		
WHT	85	68	57	89	75	66	74	93	88		
FRL	72	62	55	74	62	55	55	81	85		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	670
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Our scores remain at or above district and state averages. Our math held most consistent compared to 2021-22. We saw a +4 growth in Science; our largest jump in the last 4 years.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA BQ remains our area of improvement; we have been declining in this area since 2018.

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

The last two years we have had the same circumstances many schools have had including vacancies and high teacher and student absenteeism. Both school years we have had multiple ELA teachers go on leave, resign, etc. We need to continue to identify our BQ students early and utilize supports including teacher-led small groups. We have come a long way in the first step--identification. We now need to move from "Who?" to "What?".

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science Proficiency (8th graders) from 72% to 76% proficient.

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

We ensured that once of our vacancies (which originally included 8th grade science classes) was changed in our master schedule. We moved the 8th grade classes to certified teachers.
Our IPS classes were taught by veteran teachers.

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

Use of PM data to guide instruction; ensuring teachers are on standard and there is assignment alignment between grade level standards and tasks students are asked to complete.

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.

All teachers will be receiving PD on the BEST standards and the new PM (FAST) testing progress monitoring assessments via HCPS curriculum dept.

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

Continuation of our trajectory of learning with teachers; Years 1 and 2 focused on Knowledge of Students; we are now moving towards supporting our BQ through teacher-led small groups which is a continuation of our plan from the the last 2 years. We will continue Tier 2 Intervention of ELP tutoring with BQ math and ELA students.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our ELA Learning Gains, including BQ data is our area of improvement. We have identified teacher led small groups as a form of differentiation that teachers can use in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will increase our ELA learning gains from 59% to 62%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Classroom Observations for use of teacher led small groups PM FAST data in ELA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Odalys Pritchard (odalys.pritchard@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teacher led small groups
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	John Hattie found small group instruction has an effect size of.47. (Hattie source) Because that is above .40 for effect size, small group instruction is often automatically on a teacher's list of research-based activities.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review FSA reading data with teachers and provide rosters of students per period who are in the BQ for reading.

Person Responsible	Robert Chisholm (robert.chisholm@hcps.net)

Provide and update global data wall with progress monitoring results. (FAST PM)

Person Responsible	Theresa Seits (theresa.seits@hcps.net)

Provide opportunities for collaboration, professional learning, and peer observations on teacher-led small groups at CMS

Person Responsible	Odalys Pritchard (odalys.pritchard@hcps.net)

Monitor PM FAST data in 6th grade classrooms on block schedule and students in Intensive Reading 7/8.

Person Responsible	Odalys Pritchard (odalys.pritchard@hcps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We have worked for the last two school years (2020-21 and 2021-22) on school/student culture via THE COBRA WAY. The COBRA WAY is an acronym (Courteous, Optimistic, Brave, Responsible and Active) that describes our student expectations; our schoolwide expectations were developed by a voluntary committee of school staff over the last two school years. This year we will add the PBIS component of a token economy via the PBIS "app." and a school store. Our goal is to increase clarity of expectations for students in all school settings to reduce student rule infractions and reward positive behavior.
We will also continue our book study of Leader in Me by Steven Covey. Our ILT read Leader in Me last year and this year our goal is for the ILT to share the "7 habits" with staff in order to continue our learning on the importance and impact of teacher and student efficacy. Our theme for 22-23 is "Builders Leaders the COBRA WAY".
In addition, we continue to offer opportunities for teachers to collaborate and have their voices heard via committees, surveys, etc in order to build a culture of trust and a collective effort towards our school wide SIP goal. We also introduced teacher goal setting this year and encouraged teachers to set goals with students.
Moreover, we will be revisiting our school mission and vision via a series of activities as a staff.
Finally, we address the tangible side of a positive staff climate via various teacher appreciation events and recognition from peers and administration.

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

Administration- all areas
All teachers- Using the PBIS app for student recognition' providing opportunities for student leadership in class and outside of class
Cobra Expectation Committee-PBIS
ILT-sharing learnings from Leader in Me with Staff
Subject Area PLC's- collaborating and planning as content area teams
Sunshine Committee-Team building and staff Appreciation events
Teacher Club Sponsors-Sponsoring Student Clubs for students