Hillsborough County Public Schools

Barrington Middle School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 5

Needs Assessment 6

Planning for Improvement 12

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 14

Barrington Middle School

5925 VILLAGE CENTER DR, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Amy Rappleyea

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2013

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Barrington Middle School will create a climate of responsibility and exploration as it enables adolescents to demonstrate academic and social growth.

Provide the school's vision statement

Barrington Middle School will create a collegiate atmosphere and prepare all students to reach their highest potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rappleyea, Amy	Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	1	493	548	569	0	0	0	0	1611
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	41	44	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	20	30	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	96	98	0	0	0	0	314
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	73	75	0	0	0	0	248

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	76	65	59	0	0	0	0	200

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	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	39	51	0	0	0	0	140

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 1/19/2020

Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	46	41	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	34	15	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	36	31	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	31	112	0	0	0	0	208

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	39	19	9	0	0	0	0	67

Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	46	41	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	34	15	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	36	31	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	31	112	0	0	0	0	208

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	39	19	9	0	0	0	0	67

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	51%	54%	65%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	52%	54%	60%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	47%	47%	51%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	75%	55%	58%	71%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	57%	62%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	45%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	47%	51%	58%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	67%	72%	79%	66%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	493 (0)	548 (0)	569 (0)	1610 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	35 (33)	41 (46)	44 (41)	120 (120)
One or more suspensions	26 (6)	20 (34)	30 (15)	76 (55)
Course failure in ELA or Math	120 (28)	96 (36)	98 (31)	314 (95)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	100 (65)	73 (31)	75 (112)	248 (208)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	65%	53%	12%	54%	11%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	63%	54%	9%	52%	11%
	2018	66%	52%	14%	51%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	66%	53%	13%	56%	10%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	71%	49%	22%	55%	16%
	2018	67%	48%	19%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	80%	62%	18%	54%	26%
	2018	78%	61%	17%	54%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	36%	31%	5%	46%	-10%
	2018	30%	29%	1%	45%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	57%	47%	10%	48%	9%
	2018	58%	48%	10%	50%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	81%	67%	14%	71%	10%
2018	78%	65%	13%	71%	7%
Compare		3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	85%	63%	22%	62%	23%
Compare		8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	93%	57%	36%	57%	36%
2018	96%	56%	40%	56%	40%
Compare		-3%			

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	28	45	38	37	40	29	19	58	67		
ELL	25	53	55	42	66	61	33	50			
ASN	89	71		92	85		92	93	93		
BLK	53	51	43	63	64	50	37	75	74		
HSP	54	59	59	67	64	48	43	79	78		
MUL	66	59	52	74	68	59	68	81	68		
WHT	72	60	40	82	71	53	65	86	88		
FRL	46	51	48	58	57	45	31	70	71		

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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	30	43	35	34	46	34	23	42	79		
ELL	31	54	50	36	42	27	19	38			
ASN	76	48		81	73		64	92	100		
BLK	57	60	57	61	55	48	43	76	77		
HSP	53	57	49	60	56	43	46	67	78		
MUL	65	69	50	72	65	29	73	88	81		
WHT	73	62	51	77	65	48	66	85	80		
FRL	51	56	50	56	53	40	45	65	71		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	651
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	88
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	57
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	61
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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

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	69
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The students with disabilities had an achievement of 19% in science. The SWD group also performed below the school in ELA, which could have contributed to the low science score.

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

The Black students showed the largest decline in gains on the ELA. Of particular concern, the bottom quartile (L25) Black students, dropped from 57% to 43% ELA gains or a drop of 14%.

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

Grade 8 Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. With more students taking algebra, there were less students taking the Grade 8 Math FSA.

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

The percentage of students taking algebra increased from 85% to 93%. This was accomplished by carefully placing students into appropriate courses.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

While, the sixth grade is the smallest group of the three grade level cohorts, they have the most ELA/Math failures and the highest number of students with 2 or more indicators. Another concern is the high number of level 1 students in all three grade levels.

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

Our highest instructional priorities for the 2019-2020 school year are:
1. Increasing vocabulary understanding, usage and application in both reading and writing in the content areas to decrease the number of students at L1 ELA.
2. Continue to incorporate the use of WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, Reading) strategies to increase ELA schoolwide, Math scores (especially for our lowest performing students), and Science scores, as well as to maintain or increase our Civics scores.
3. Improve teacher craft and use of high impact strategies in all content areas to increase ELA scores schoolwide, Math scores, and Science scores as well as to maintain or increase our Civics scores.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	1. Increasing vocabulary understanding, usage and application in both reading and writing in the content areas to decrease the number of students at L1 ELA.
Rationale	We want to decrease the number of students in L1 and bottom quartile. By incorporating vocabulary usage throughout all content areas, our students will be prepared to both read and write on the FSA ELA in Spring 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Barrington Middle School will decrease the number of students in the botttom quartile in ELA from 49% to 46%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Rappleyea (amy.rappleyea@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will utilize vocabulary strategies including concept maps, word walls, student discussion, Cornell notes, text marking, unpacking the task, and CCC format.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	CCC format requires students to carefully analyze the prompt and prepare their claim, claim evidence, and commentary in a manner consistent with Florida standards and it provides opportunities for students to extend their thinking.
Action Step	
Description	1. Practice using the CCC format in all classes. Have CCC student examples posted. 2. Refer to CCC format while teaching and analyzing texts. Have CCC posters in all classrooms. 3. Utilize word walls to increase vocabulary usage. These will be referred to throughout lessons. 4. Increase student use of vocabulary during questioning and discussion by having question stems available.
Person Responsible	Amy Rappleyea (amy.rappleyea@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	
Rationale	
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part V: Budget

1	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: 1. Increasing vocabulary understanding, usage and application in both reading and writing in the content areas to decrease the number of students at L1 ELA.**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus:**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**