

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Ferrell Middle Magnet School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 21 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 21 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Diehl, Cara | Principal | |
| Turner, Eric | Assistant Principal | |
| White, Carla | Assistant Principal | |
| Stanton, Anna | Administrative Support | |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and students answered survey questions about needs. Ideas were discussed at the SAC, PTSA, and ILT Meetings.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored through ILT, PLC, Student Services, and Leadership Steering Meetings.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--------|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 83% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 40 | 20 | 97 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 39 | 29 | 81 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 23 | 0 | 65 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 12 | 0 | 41 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 23 | 0 | 65 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 24 | 84 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | | | | | | | | | 40 | 22 | 62 |
| One or more suspensions | | | | | | | | | 3 | 25 | 28 |
| Course failure in ELA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Course failure in Math | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | | | | | | | | | 20 | 32 | 52 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | | | | | | | | | 22 | 25 | 47 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | | | | | | | | 20 | 32 | 52 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 30 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 22 | 62 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 28 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 32 | 52 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 25 | 47 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 32 | 52 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 30 | |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 54 | 49 | 49 | 51 | 50 | 50 | 51 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 50 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 38 | | | 42 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 72 | 57 | 56 | 60 | 36 | 36 | 47 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 74 | | | 52 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 72 | | | 46 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 51 | 44 | 49 | 45 | 52 | 53 | 32 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 73 | 66 | 68 | 81 | 58 | 58 | 63 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 96 | 84 | 73 | 99 | 51 | 49 | 75 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 46 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 74 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 39 | 40 | | 86 | 76 | | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 346 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 63 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 570 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 24 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 59 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 70 | | | |
| BLK | 64 | | | |
| HSP | 71 | | | |
| MUL | 68 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | | | |
| FRL | 66 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 29 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 51 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 59 | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | |
| MUL | 76 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | | | |
| FRL | 60 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 54 | | | 72 | | | 51 | 73 | 96 | | | |
| SWD | 21 | | | 24 | | | 9 | 42 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 36 | | | 60 | | | 38 | | 100 | | 4 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 60 | | | 80 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 50 | | | 66 | | | 40 | 68 | 96 | | 5 | |
| HSP | 55 | | | 73 | | | 50 | 75 | 100 | | 5 | |
| MUL | 58 | | | 78 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | 80 | | | 64 | 88 | 89 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 50 | | | 69 | | | 48 | 67 | 96 | | 5 | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 51 | 50 | 38 | 60 | 74 | 72 | 45 | 81 | 99 | | | |
| SWD | 12 | 32 | 33 | 24 | 47 | 47 | 10 | | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 46 | 38 | 57 | 74 | 65 | 24 | 67 | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 48 | 40 | 49 | 67 | 72 | 35 | 79 | 100 | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 50 | 36 | 64 | 76 | 70 | 56 | 76 | 95 | | | |
| MUL | 77 | 45 | | 82 | 75 | | | 100 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 59 | | 86 | 91 | | 64 | 81 | 100 | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 46 | 37 | 54 | 72 | 71 | 37 | 80 | 98 | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 51 | 50 | 42 | 47 | 52 | 46 | 32 | 63 | 75 | | | |
| SWD | 11 | 25 | 30 | 13 | 30 | 26 | 14 | 28 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 49 | 48 | 37 | 44 | 43 | 21 | 48 | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 65 | | 67 | 48 | | 67 | 84 | 95 | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 49 | 43 | 43 | 51 | 48 | 28 | 60 | 70 | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 47% | 4% | 47% | 4% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 44% | 12% | 47% | 9% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 47% | 3% | 47% | 3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 53% | 16% | 54% | 15% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 36% | 15% | 48% | 3% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 74% | 57% | 17% | 55% | 19% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 41% | 9% | 44% | 6% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 99% | 55% | 44% | 50% | 49% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 49% | * | 48% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 72% | 64% | 8% | 66% | 6% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our 6th-grade students made the least amount of proficiency growth between PM1 and PM3 in ELA. Our 8th-grade students who took the Civics test grossly underperformed compared to the 7th graders.

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

Our Civics proficiency scores decreased from 81% to 74%. We believe this may be because 7th graders who tested at Level 1 in reading waited to take Civics in their 8th-grade year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

We were higher than the state averages in all categories.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was our math proficiency which increased from 60% to 67%. 8th grade Science has also increased proficiency from 45% to 51%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

1. With 22% of students in grades 6-8 absent 10% or more days, we will work closely with the student services team to improve student attendance outcomes.

2. With 81 students having one or more suspensions, we will review student discipline data and create action steps to decrease OSS rates.

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

1. Enhance implementation of progress monitoring and use of data to drive strategic planning and instruction.
2. Implement a whole-school literacy focus and strategy (PIE).
3. Increase the sense of belonging among our students from 31% to 40% (based on 22-23 Panorama survey data) by promoting positive activities that encourage inclusiveness.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Implement a whole-school literacy focus and strategy (Pre-reading, Interacting with the text, Extending beyond the text)

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If we effectively utilize comprehension-based strategies schoolwide then:

The percentage of students achieving proficiency on

The percentage of students achieving proficiency on

- FSA ELA will increase from 52% to 57%,
- Civics EOC will increase from 74% to 79%
- SSA will increase from 51 to 56%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Literacy data will be monitored twice a quarter by ILT

Success Coach and Lead Magnet Teacher will facilitate Level 3 interventions (review monthly)

Literacy strategies will be implemented per semester by PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Routinely use comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. Students with reading difficulties often have difficulty understanding what they read. Many students view reading as a frustrating task and may rush through a passage rather than try to figure out its meaning.

By the time students are in upper-elementary grades, reading material in all subject areas conveys information and ideas that students are expected to learn and understand. When students are unable to understand these texts, they miss crucial opportunities to learn grade-level content. This recommendation aims to provide teachers with ways to support students as they learn and practice routines and develop reading habits that promote reading comprehension. These supports can be gradually withdrawn as students gain competence in making sense of the text. (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/practiceguide/WWC-SummaryReadingInterven4-9.pdf>)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Enhance implementation of progress monitoring and use of data to drive strategic planning and differentiated instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If we effectively progress monitor student learning and plan differentiated instruction that supports standards-based instruction, then:

The percentage of students achieving proficiency on

- FSA ELA will increase from 52% to 57%,
- FSA Math will increase from 67% to 72%
- Civics EOC will increase from 74% to 79%
- SSA will increase from 51 to 56%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring reading data will be monitored twice a quarter by ILT
Success Coach and Lead Magnet Teacher will facilitate Level 3 interventions (review monthly)

Differentiation strategies will be implemented per semester by PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Differentiation

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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, and teaching to the student's zone of proximal development. (Iris.Peabody.Vanderbilt.edu)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

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

Calendar out common assessments in core content to drive instruction.

Core content training on HCPS Instructional Frameworks. Focus on small groups and individual needs. Will be monitored in PLCs on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible: Cara Diehl (cara.diehl@hcps.net)

By When: Bi-Weekly implementation of data-driven instruction. Progress monitoring data will be monitored in PLCs and ILT Monthly.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase sense of belonging among our students by promoting schoolwide and student-specific positive activities that encourage inclusiveness.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will increase student sense of belonging from 31% to 40% as measured on the student Panorama survey.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student discipline data and attendance data will be reviewed quarterly to determine if promoting student sense of belonging has positively impacted out of school suspensions and attendance rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Student services will work closely with student families and primary adult caregivers in addressing individual student needs related to attendance.
2. Student support/friendship lunch group led by a student services team member for students identified as having emotional challenges, and/or needing a positive connection during the school day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Students with poor attendance may suffer from specific challenges that make it difficult to get to school. Student services can provide support to those families by ensuring they are aware of the absences and understand the potential implications for the student (i.e., academic, lack of driving privileges).
2. If students feel like they belong at school and have both student and trusted adults as support, they may be more inclined to attend school regularly. Students may also be less likely to exhibit behaviors warranting out of school suspension if they feel a strong sense of belonging to their school community.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Student services team is instructed to identify students with lowest attendance rates and contacts primary adult caregivers.

Person Responsible: Cara Diehl (cara.diehl@hcps.net)

By When: End of first nine weeks

School psychologist is instructed to identify students who could benefit from a student support/friendship lunch group and meets weekly with those students.

Person Responsible: Cara Diehl (cara.diehl@hcps.net)

By When: By end of first nine weeks, meeting weekly.

Student services team and magnet lead work collaboratively to plan schoolwide events to promote sense of belonging for students. These include pep rallies, mother-daughter day, father-daughter dance,

Person Responsible: Anna Stanton (anna.stanton@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly pep rallies, Fall Mother-Daughter Day, Spring Father-Daughter Dance

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The process of reviewing and allocating school improvement funding based on needs involves collecting and analyzing data, conducting needs assessments, setting goals, devising a resource allocation strategy, ensuring equity, engaging stakeholders, transparently communicating the process, implementing interventions, monitoring progress, making adjustments based on evaluation, and documenting the entire process. This approach ensures that resources are distributed equitably, aligned with identified needs, and effectively utilized to improve student performance and address specific challenges within our school.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

A comprehensive approach is employed to ensure effective dissemination of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) progress. This plan involves utilizing the school's website as a centralized hub for accessible materials, supplemented by newsletters and email updates that provide concise yet informative summaries to families, staff, and the community. Additionally, interactive workshops, open houses, and information sessions are organized to engage stakeholders directly, presenting the information through visuals and presentations to enhance understanding. Collaborations with local organizations and multilingual materials further broaden the reach of this information, while social media platforms and mobile apps serve as dynamic channels for delivering updates and key messages. A feedback mechanism and regular reports foster interaction and transparency, ensuring that stakeholders remain

informed, engaged, and equipped to comprehend the progress and goals of the SIP, UniSIG budget, and SWP.

In this multifaceted dissemination strategy, the emphasis is on clarity, accessibility, and engagement. By employing these channels and methods, schools aim to empower stakeholders to understand and contribute to the ongoing success of their educational initiatives.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Ferrell Middle Magnet School is dedicated to fostering strong partnerships with parents, families, and community stakeholders to align with its mission. Ferrell aims to keep parents well-informed about their child's progress, academic achievements, and extracurricular activities through regular communication channels such as newsletters, workshops, and open houses. Additionally, the establishment of collaborative initiatives, such as parent-teacher conferences and community engagement events, serves to address student needs holistically while creating a positive and inclusive educational environment where all stakeholders are valued participants in the educational journey.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Ferrell's strategy for enhancing its academic program involves a multi-faceted approach: by extending learning time through after-school programs, incorporating technology-assisted learning, and offering advanced courses, the school aims to enrich and accelerate the curriculum. This will enable students to delve deeper into subjects of interest and explore diverse academic pathways, fostering a dynamic learning environment that caters to individual needs, promotes critical thinking, and cultivates a passion for continuous intellectual growth.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Ferrell is committed to providing comprehensive student support beyond academic subjects by implementing a range of services. Students receive personalized guidance through dedicated counseling staff, school-based mental health services, and specialized support programs to enhance their emotional well-being and social skills. Additionally, mentoring initiatives foster positive relationships between students and mentors, enabling holistic development and the acquisition of essential life skills. These

integrated strategies create a nurturing and inclusive environment where students can thrive not only academically but also emotionally and socially.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Ferrell is committed to preparing students for postsecondary opportunities and the workforce through a multifaceted approach. This includes promoting awareness of various pathways, including career and technical education (CTE) programs offering hands-on training and skills development. Additionally, the school aims to broaden students' access to advanced coursework, allowing them to earn high school credits while still in middle school. By offering diverse courses and experiences, the school equips students with the skills, knowledge, and insights needed to make informed decisions about their future education and career paths, ensuring a smooth transition to higher education and the workforce.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Ferrell has instituted a comprehensive schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address concerning behaviors. By integrating proactive behavioral interventions across three tiers of support, the school identifies students' needs at various levels and delivers targeted interventions to mitigate behavioral challenges. These efforts are closely coordinated with the provisions of IDEA, ensuring that students requiring special education services receive individualized support that effectively addresses their unique needs, fostering a positive and inclusive learning environment for all.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Ferrell is dedicated to enhancing instruction through ongoing professional learning opportunities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other staff, focusing on effective data utilization from academic assessments. Workshops, collaborative sessions, and training programs are designed to equip educators with data-driven insights to tailor instruction and support student growth. Additionally, efforts to recruit and retain effective teachers, especially in high-need subjects, include mentorship programs and targeted professional development paths, creating a supportive ecosystem that ensures instructional excellence and student achievement.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A