2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Hardee Junior High School

2401 US HIGHWAY 17 N
Wauchula, FL 33873
863-773-3147
www.hardee.k12.fl.us/junior_high

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Middle School	Yes	85%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	70%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10
D	F	D	C	B

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
    - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
    - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
    - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
    - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
    - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Focus Year 1	4	Jim Browder

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School
Hardee Junior High School

Principal
Douglas Herron

School Advisory Council chair
Samuel Rivera

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Douglas Herron	Principal
Beverly Cornelius	Assistant Principal
Meredith Durastanti	Assistant Principal
Bradley Warren	Literacy Coach
Kerry Terrell	Guidance Counselor
Courtney Andersen	Guidance Counselor
Mark Carlton	Dean of Students
Sharon Knight	Dean of Students

District-Level Information

District
Hardee

Superintendent
Mr. David D Durastanti

Date of school board approval of SIP
Pending

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Douglas Herron, Principal
Samuel Rivera, SAC Chair, Teacher
Alicia Munoz, Parent
Lucia Villalva, Parent
Maria Hernandez, Parent
Wendy Floyd, Parent
Linda Harrison, Parent
Debbie Macedo, Parent
Chic Cook, Parent

Krupa Ahir, Student
Amy Rigney, Parent
Annette Zuniga, Parent
Martina Zuniga, Parent

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

Input solicited from the SAC at the conclusion of the 2012-2013 school year was used in the creation of this plan.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC will approve the plan as board approved. The SAC will monitor the plan during their scheduled quarterly meetings. The SAC will be informed of any changes to the plan as directed by the DOE's Regional Differentiated Accountability (DA) Team. Input from the SAC will be included in any changes that might be suggested by the Regional DA Team.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

Use of SAC school improvement funds will be decided during the SAC meeting scheduled for Thursday, 10/10/13.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC
In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff
This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators
3

receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Douglas Herron		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 9	Years at Current School: 9

Credentials	BA in Business Administration from Warner Southern College MEd from the University of South Florida Certifications: School Principal (All Levels); Economics (6-12); and Mathematics (5-9)
Performance Record	2004-2005: School grade of C; 48% of students met high standards in reading; 56% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 54% of students made learning gains in reading; 64% of students made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2005-2006: School grade of B; 51% of students met high standards in reading; 59% of students met high standards in math; 75% of students met high standards in writing; 63% of students made learning gains in reading; 69% of students made learning gains in math; 69% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2006-2007: School grade of C; 54% of students met high standards in reading; 54% of students met high standards in math; 77% of students met high standards in writing; 28% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 66% of students made learning gains in math; 63% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2007-2008: School grade of B; 58% of students met high standards in reading; 65% of students met high standards in math; 88% of students met high standards in writing; 36% of students met high standards in science; 60% of students made learning gains in reading; 73% of students made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2008-2009: School grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 25% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 72% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2009-2010: School grade of B; 62% of students met high standards in reading; 62% of students met high standards in math; 78% of students met high standards in writing; 41% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 65% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 60% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly

Progress (AYP) not met.

2010-2011: School grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 74% of students met high standards in writing; 38% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met.

2011-2012: School grade of D; 44% of students met high standards in reading; 43% of students met high standards in math; 62% of students met high standards in writing; 29% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 55% of students made learning gains in math; 61% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 51% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math.

2012-2013: School grade of F; 43% of students met high standards in reading; 39% of students met high standards in math; 26% of students met high standards in writing; 32% of students met high standards in science; 54% of students made learning gains in reading; 48% of students made learning gains in math; 51% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 44% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math.

Beverly Cornelius		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 8	Years at Current School: 8

Credentials	BA in Elementary Education from Warner Southern College MEd in Education Leadership from the University of South Florida Certifications: School Principal (All Levels); Elementary Education (K-6); Reading Endorsement (All Levels) ESOL Endorsement
Performance Record	2004-2005: School grade of C; 48% of students met high standards in reading; 56% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 54% of students made learning gains in reading; 64% of students made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2005-2006: School grade of B; 51% of students met high standards in reading; 59% of students met high standards in math; 75% of students met high standards in writing; 63% of students made learning gains in reading; 69% of students made learning gains in math; 69% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2006-2007: School grade of C; 54% of students met high standards in reading; 54% of students met high standards in math; 77% of students met high standards in writing; 28% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 66% of students made learning gains in math; 63% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2007-2008: School grade of B; 58% of students met high standards in reading; 65% of students met high standards in math; 88% of students met high standards in writing; 36% of students met high standards in science; 60% of students made learning gains in reading; 73% of students made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2008-2009: School grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 25% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 72% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2009-2010: School grade of B; 62% of students met high standards in reading; 62% of students met high standards in math; 78% of students met high standards in writing; 41% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 65% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 60% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly

Progress (AYP) not met.

2010-2011: School grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 74% of students met high standards in writing; 38% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met.

2011-2012: School grade of D; 44% of students met high standards in reading; 43% of students met high standards in math; 62% of students met high standards in writing; 29% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 55% of students made learning gains in math; 61% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 51% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math.

2012-2013: School grade of F; 43% of students met high standards in reading; 39% of students met high standards in math; 26% of students met high standards in writing; 32% of students met high standards in science; 54% of students made learning gains in reading; 48% of students made learning gains in math; 51% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 44% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math.

Meredith Durastanti		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 6	Years at Current School: 6
Credentials	BA in Exceptional Student Education from the University of South Florida MEd in Educational Leadership from the University of South Florida Certifications: Educational Leadership (All Levels); ESE (K-12); ESOL Endorsement	
Performance Record	2007-2008: School grade of B; 58% of students met high standards in reading; 65% of students met high standards in math; 88% of students met high standards in writing; 36% of students met high standards in science; 60% of students made learning gains in reading; 73% of students made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2008-2009: School grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 25% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 72% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2009-2010: School grade of B; 62% of students met high standards in reading; 62% of students met high standards in math; 78% of students met high standards in writing; 41% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 65% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 60% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2010-2011: School grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 74% of students met high standards in writing; 38% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) not met. 2011-2012: School grade of D; 44% of students met high standards in reading; 43% of students met high standards in math; 62% of students met high standards in writing; 29% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 55% of students made learning gains in math; 61% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 51% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math. 2012-2013: School grade of F; 43% of students met high standards in reading; 39% of students met high standards in	

math; 26% of students met high standards in writing; 32% of students met high standards in science; 54% of students made learning gains in reading; 48% of students made learning gains in math; 51% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 44% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math.

Instructional Coaches

# of instructional coaches

1

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Bradley Warren		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 1	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, Science, Data, RtI/MTSS	
Credentials	BA in Elementary Education from Western Michigan University MA in Educational Leadership from Western Michigan University Certifications: Educational Leadership (All Levels); Reading Endorsement	
Performance Record	2012-2013: School grade of F; 43% of students met high standards in reading; 39% of students met high standards in math; 26% of students met high standards in writing; 32% of students met high standards in science; 54% of students made learning gains in reading; 48% of students made learning gains in math; 51% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 44% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math.	

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers

71

 # receiving effective rating or higher

0%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers

93%

 # certified in-field

62, 87%

 # ESOL endorsed

66, 93%

 # reading endorsed

10, 14%

 # with advanced degrees

9, 13%

 # National Board Certified

1, 1%

 # first-year teachers

3, 4%

 # with 1-5 years of experience

19, 27%

 # with 6-14 years of experience

25, 35%

 # with 15 or more years of experience

25, 35%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals

12

 # Highly Qualified

12, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

4

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Participation in the Great Florida Teach-In: Douglas Herron, Principal
New Teacher Signing Bonus: Greg Harrelson, Director of Finance
District's Connections Program for Beginning Teachers: Jan McKibben, District Highly-Qualified Facilitator and Bradley Warren, HJH Literacy Coach
Pairing of Beginning Teachers with a Highly-Qualified, Experienced, and Proven Educator in a Mentor/Mentee Relationship: Bradley Warren, HJH Literacy Coach

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Beginning teachers are formally paired with Mr. Bradley Warren, HJH's Literacy Coach. Mr. Warren's experience, expertise, and personality make him an obvious choice as a mentor for new teachers. Additionally, all beginning teachers are informally paired with their departmental PLC leader. The PLC

leaders experience and expertise within their certified, core academic area make them obvious choices as secondary mentors for our new teachers.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

Our MTSS team consists of Curriculum Leadership Team members. This team: (1) provides data on tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 targets; (2) identifies academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; (3) sets expectations for instruction; (4) facilitates the development of a systemic approach to teaching; and (5) helps align processes and procedures.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

Principal and Assistant Principals (Douglas Herron, Beverly Cornelius, and Meredith Durastanti): Provide a common vision for the use of data in the decision making process. Insures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI. Conducts periodic assessments of the MTSS/RtI skills of relevant school staff. Insures the implementation of intervention support and documentation. Insures adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI implementation. Communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.
General Education Teachers: Provide information regarding core instruction. Participates in the collection of student achievement data. Delivers tier 1 instruction. Collaborate with other staff to implement tier 2 interventions. Integrates tier 1 materials and instruction with tier 2 and 3 activities.
Literacy Coach (Bradley Warren): Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards and programs. Identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum, behavior assessments, and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while coordinating with district personnel to identify appropriate evidence-based intervention strategies. Assists with school-wide screening programs that provide early intervention services for students considered to be "at-risk." Assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, and data collection/ analysis. Participates in the design and delivery of professional development. Provides guidance and support on district K-12 Reading Plan.
Guidance Counselor (Courtney Andersen) and School Psychologist (Alicia Jefferson): Provide technical and professional expertise and assistance. Mrs. Jefferson also offers an outsiders perspective to the team, providing an objective voice in the process.
Deans of Students (Mark Carlton and Sharon Knight): Provides services and expertise on behavioral issues and intervention procedures with individual students.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The fidelity of our MTSS/RtI program, as well as the SIP, is monitored through frequent progress monitoring, using the following data collection methods.
Baseline Data: Prior year FCAT, District Benchmark Assessment 1, FAIR, School-wide writing assessments, iReady Baseline, as well as discipline and attendance data.
Mid-year Data: District BM Assessment 2, FAIR, School-wide writing assessments, iReady Formative Assessments, as well as discipline and attendance data.
End-of-year Data: FCAT, District Benchmark Assessment 3, FAIR, School-wide writing assessments, iReady Formative/Summative Assessments, as well as discipline and attendance data.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Florida's Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) and the District's Performance Matters data storage and analysis tool. These management systems receive student achievement data from the following sources: FCAT, FAIR, and District Benchmarks.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Teachers and other relevant staff will receive ongoing professional development in the MTSS/RtI data-based problem solving process. Parents will be informed of the MTSS/RtI data-based problem solving process during our parent/teacher data-chat events, as well as other parent involvement activities.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 5,400

After-school program to target lowest quartiles in math and reading, Algebra I students, and struggling Civics students. This program is projected to begin the first week of November, and will run three days per week through the end of March/first of April. Taking out holidays, the program will run approximately 60 days, at 90 minutes each day, for a total of 5400 additional instructional minutes.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

District Benchmark and FAIR data for participating students will be analyzed and compared to the BM and FAIR data for all students to determine if additional instructional time is contributing to student growth and achievement beyond the core instructional day.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, and Core-Academic Teachers.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Douglas Herron	Principal
Beverly Cornelius	Assistant Principal
Meredith Durastanti	Assistant Principal

Name	Title
Bradley Warren	Literacy Coach
Kathryn Maddox	Language Arts/Reading PLC Leader
Marie Price	Math PLC Leader
Leslie Moon	Science PLC Co-Leader
Kim McGuckin	Science PLC Co-Leader
Beverly McClellan	Social Studies PLC Leader
April Rogers	Elective/Special Areas PLC Leader
Barbara Kelly	ESE Representative

How the school-based LLT functions

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) meets the 2nd or 3rd Wednesday of each month, from 7:30 a.m. - 8:30 a.m. The principal, Douglas Herron, sets the agenda and leads the meetings. Assistant Principal, Beverly Cornelius, insures that all members sign in, keeping track of attendance and agenda documentation for Title I records. The LLT will frequently monitor student achievement data, setting and adjusting goals according to the strengths and weaknesses indicated by the data. Conversations will always be around instruction and student achievement.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The LLT will monitor our MTTS/RtI and Positive Behavior Support (PBS) systems for fidelity of implementation. The LLT will monitor school-wide initiatives (AVID, SpringBoard, DBQ) to determine their impact on instruction and student achievement.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Every teacher at Hardee Junior High School has participated in Professional Development trainings that includes Achievement Via Individual Determination (AVID) and Kagan Cooperative Learning Strategies. The Literacy Leadership Team attended the Common Core Summer Institute, and are conducting ongoing training in their content-specific Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings. Language Arts and Reading teachers participated in Springboard College Readiness training. Social Studies teachers participated in Document Based Questioning Strategies training. All teachers are required to incorporate WICOR strategies into their daily lesson plans and instructional practices. Every teacher at Hardee Junior High School understands that they are literacy teachers, assigned to a specific content area.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

Hardee Junior High School has added the following career and tech ed/vocational courses for the 2013-2014 school year:
Foundations of Agriculture - This high school credit course will allow participating students to see the relevance of science to the real-world career field of agriculture. Participating students will be prepared to enter Hardee Senior High School's advanced agriculture coursework.

Photoshop - Participating students in this career and technical education course will be able to sit for the Adobe Photoshop Industry Certification Exam. Students who pass the exam will be certified to work with Adobe Photoshop within relevant industries. Course participation will also provide students with relevance between their academic work and real-world work experience.

Dreamweaver - Participating students in this career and technical education course will be able to sit for the Adobe Dreamweaver Industry Certification Exam. Students who pass the exam will be certified to work with Adobe Dreamweaver within relevant industries. Course participation will also provide students with relevance between their academic work and real-world work experience.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

All Hardee Junior High School students complete a semester long course in careers prior to being promoted to high school. The curriculum for this course provides exposure to various career fields, while providing students with the educational requirements for working in these fields. All Hardee Junior High School students also complete an ePep online planning/scheduling template prior to being promoted to high school. The ePep is designed to assist students with course selection at the high school level, based on the post-secondary plans and aspirations of the student. The ePep is completed with assistance and guidance from our career education teacher, as well as the Hardee Junior High School guidance staff.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

Provide rigorous, relevant, and meaningful curriculum and instruction to all students.

Engage students in the instructional process, allowing then to be active participants in their education.

Communicate frequently with parents and other stakeholders regarding academic and behavioral expectations of students.

Create a culture of high expectations for administration, teachers, support staff, students, and parents.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	54%	43%	No	59%
American Indian				
Asian	53%	55%	Yes	57%
Black/African American	49%	35%	No	54%
Hispanic	48%	38%	No	53%
White	66%	52%	No	69%
English language learners	17%	8%	No	25%
Students with disabilities	31%	14%	No	38%
Economically disadvantaged	49%	39%	No	54%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	304	26%	28%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	186	16%	18%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		25%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		31%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	507	43%	45%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	601	51%	53%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	12	41%	43%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		9%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		5%

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	98	26%	28%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		22%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	56%	39%	No	60%
American Indian				
Asian	83%	64%	No	84%
Black/African American	51%	19%	No	56%
Hispanic	51%	38%	No	56%
White	63%	44%	No	66%
English language learners	33%	8%	No	39%
Students with disabilities	33%	15%	No	39%
Economically disadvantaged	53%	36%	No	57%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	225	21%	29%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	138	13%	22%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		17%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		44%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	566	48%	53%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	519	44%	50%

Middle School Acceleration

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry certifications	80	51%	55%
Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications	80	100%	100%

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	30	37%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	50	63%	65%

Area 4: Science

Middle School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	68	18%	26%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	49	13%	21%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		40%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		20%

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	4		
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	180	15%	20%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	0	0%	
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more *accelerated* courses	0	0%	
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in *accelerated* courses		0%	
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	0	0%	
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		0%	
CTE program concentrators	0	0%	
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	0	0%	

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Middle School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	11	0%	0%
Students who fail a mathematics course	12	1%	0%
Students who fail an English Language Arts course	14	1%	0%
Students who fail two or more courses in any subject	9	0%	0%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	345	29%	20%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	58	5%	3%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Increase participation totals for all parent involvement events by 15%. This increase will be based upon the total number of participants (indicated by sign-in sheets) for all parent involvement events.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
15% increase in the number of participants for all parent involvement events	525	44%	59%

Goals Summary

G1. All instructional staff will engage in rigorous instruction to increase student achievement and prepare them for college and career readiness.

Goals Detail

G1. All instructional staff will engage in rigorous instruction to increase student achievement and prepare them for college and career readiness.

Targets Supported

- All Areas
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- Science - Middle School
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- STEM - High School
- CTE
- Parental Involvement
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School
- EWS - Middle School
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation
- Additional Targets

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- AVID Strategies
- Ongoing Professional Development
- Kagan Structures
- Springboard Curriculum

- Document Based Questioning

- Administrative Support

- Instructional Coaches

- DA Regional Team Support

- PLC Book Study

- Math and Science Resource Teacher for Small Group Instruction

- Peer Teachers

- Technology

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Low Expectations of Students by Staff

- Teachers do not routinely engage in instructional best practices.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

All instructional staff engaged in rigorous instruction and an increase in student achievement

Person or Persons Responsible

School Based Administration, Literacy Coach, District DA Team, Regional DA Team

Target Dates or Schedule:

Benchmark Test and FAIR Test Data- 3 Times Per Year

Evidence of Completion:

Increases in Student Achievement as Evidenced by Benchmark Test and FAIR Data, walk through observation data, FCAT 2.0, Algebra and Civics EOC

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal   **B** = Barrier   **S** = Strategy

G1. All instructional staff will engage in rigorous instruction to increase student achievement and prepare them for college and career readiness.

G1.B1 Low Expectations of Students by Staff

G1.B1.S1 Explicit communication of expectations to all instructional staff, with ongoing professional development aligned to areas of need identified by staff survey and student data.

Action Step 1

Staff Survey

Person or Persons Responsible

School Based Leadership Team and Regional DA Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Pre-School Administration (Baseline), Friday, November 22nd, 2013. Post-School Survey Administration during the final week of May, 2014.

Evidence of Completion

Completed Surveys

Action Step 2

AVID Professional Development

Person or Persons Responsible

All Faculty and Instructional Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

District Inservice Days; Student Early-Release Days; PLC Common Planning Time; Whole Group Faculty Meetings Bi-Weekly.

Evidence of Completion

Inservice Sign-In Sheets; PLC Agendas/Minutes, Sign-In Sheets, and Minutes; Faculty Meeting Agendas, Sign-In Sheets, Minutes, and Exit Tickets.

Facilitator:

Christie McMullen, AVID Coordinator (i3 Grant); AVID Site Team

Participants:

All Faculty and Instructional Staff

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Survey

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

November 22nd, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Disaggregated Data from Survey

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Use survey data to determine precisely where teachers hold low expectations of students, using beliefs based professional development (AVID) to increase teacher expectations in these identified areas.

Person or Persons Responsible

School Based Leadership Team and Regional DA Team.

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly Review of Lesson Plans; Review of PLC Agendas and Notes; Staff Development Documentation; Classroom Walk Through Documentation.

Evidence of Completion

Post-Survey Data.

G1.B2 Teachers do not routinely engage in instructional best practices.

G1.B2.S1 Teachers will routinely engage in instructional best practices as evidenced by students collaboratively engaged in rigorous activities and measured by increases in student achievement data.

Action Step 1

Book Study of Teach Like a Champion

Person or Persons Responsible

All Faculty and Instructional Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly during PLC Common Planning Time and Bi-Weekly during Whole Group Faculty Meetings.

Evidence of Completion

PLC Agendas/Minutes and Sign-In Sheets; Faculty Meeting Agendas and Sign-In Sheets; Exit Tickets.

Facilitator:

Bradley Warren, Literacy Coach

Participants:

All Faculty and Instructional Staff

Action Step 2

Collaborative Structures Professional Development

Person or Persons Responsible

All Faculty and Instructional Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Summer Professional Development, July, 2013 - Teachers from each core-academic area were sent to content specific Kagan Structures Training. These "trainers" will use weekly PLC Common Planning Time to train their specific content area on the implementation of these Kagan Structures in their classrooms.

Evidence of Completion

PLC Agendas/minutes and Sign-In Sheets; Documentation of Collaborative Structures on subject-specific Kagan Structures Calendars. Lesson Plan documentation. Observations during weekly administrative classroom walk-through observations and DA Instructional Review walk-through observations.

Facilitator:

core academic trainers and PLC chairs

Participants:

all instructional staff

Action Step 3

Coachng Cycle Training- District Wide

Person or Persons Responsible

DA team, district

Target Dates or Schedule

December 16, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Agenda, sign in sheet

Facilitator:

DA team

Participants:

District Academic coaches

Action Step 4

Implement tiered Coaching Cycle

Person or Persons Responsible

Bradley Warren, Literacy Coach, Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

January 6, 2014

Evidence of Completion

coaching log, coaching calendar, walk through data

Facilitator:

Bradley Warren

Participants:

All instructional staff

Action Step 5

Teachers and staff collaboratively engaged in PLCs.

Person or Persons Responsible

PLC Chairs: Kathryn Maddox, Marie Price, Kim McGuckin, Leslie Moon, Beverly McClellan, April Rogers

Target Dates or Schedule

weekly

Evidence of Completion

agenda/ notes (administrative PLC checklist)/ minutes/ sign in sheets

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

Lesson Plan Documentation; Classroom Walk Through Observations; Coaching Cycle; Review of Student Generated Work Samples; Analysis of Benchmark Data

Person or Persons Responsible

School Based Administration and Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly Review of Lesson Plans; Weekly Classroom Walk Through Observations; Coaches Log; Quarterly Review of Student Work Samples; Disaggregated Benchmark Data

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans; Classroom Walk Through Observation Data Documentation; Coaches Log; Student Work Samples; Benchmark Data, agenda/ notes (administrative PLC checklist)/ minutes/ sign in sheets

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Teachers engaged in instructional best practices while students are collaboratively engaged in rigorous activities.

Person or Persons Responsible

School Based Administration, Literacy Coach, District DA Team, Regional DA Team

Target Dates or Schedule

weekly

Evidence of Completion

walk through obseravtion data, student work samples, decrease in student referrals,district benchmark data, formative and summative classroom assessments, agenda/ notes (administrative PLC checklist)/ minutes/ sign in sheets

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title I, Part A - Provides funds to all eligible district schools, in a school-wide project format, to target academic assistance to all students, professional development for teachers, and parent involvement activities. The grant is also a funding source for supplemental instructional technology.

Title I, Part C Migrant - Provides services to migrant students (Pre-K - 12th Grade) and their families. The primary goals of the migrant program is to improve the academic performance of migrant students and provide health and guidance services to them. Parent involvement/education is also an integral part of the migrant program.

Title II - Provides professional development for teachers, substitutes for release time for teachers, consultant travel, professional development stipends, mentoring bonuses, hiring bonuses, and a percentage of salaries for the Literacy Coaches, the District Resource Teacher, and the District Data Coach. The district Director of Curriculum will also assist in providing guidance and support with the staff development process.

Title III - Supports activities to assist students in becoming proficient in English. Supports teacher PD in ELL strategies and parent involvement/education.

Title X, Homeless - Provides support and activities to assist homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) - SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for level 1 readers.

Violence Prevention Programs - Red Ribbon Week is done school wide in October to promote safe and healthy habits.

Nutrition Programs - The school breakfast program offers a nutritious breakfast for full-pay students, as well as those participating in the free/reduced meal program. Such meals play an important part in supporting student achievement, as well as teaching students the elements of good nutrition. The National school lunch program provides a nutritious lunch for both full-pay and free/reduced students. Healthy food supports academic achievement by providing the necessary nutrients for student growth and development. The Summer Food Service Program provides a no-cost breakfast and lunch to community children age 18 and younger.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. All instructional staff will engage in rigorous instruction to increase student achievement and prepare them for college and career readiness.

G1.B1 Low Expectations of Students by Staff

G1.B1.S1 Explicit communication of expectations to all instructional staff, with ongoing professional development aligned to areas of need identified by staff survey and student data.

PD Opportunity 1

AVID Professional Development

Facilitator

Christie McMullen, AVID Coordinator (i3 Grant); AVID Site Team

Participants

All Faculty and Instructional Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

District Inservice Days; Student Early-Release Days; PLC Common Planning Time; Whole Group Faculty Meetings Bi-Weekly.

Evidence of Completion

Inservice Sign-In Sheets; PLC Agendas/Minutes, Sign-In Sheets, and Minutes; Faculty Meeting Agendas, Sign-In Sheets, Minutes, and Exit Tickets.

G1.B2 Teachers do not routinely engage in instructional best practices.

G1.B2.S1 Teachers will routinely engage in instructional best practices as evidenced by students collaboratively engaged in rigorous activities and measured by increases in student achievement data.

PD Opportunity 1

Book Study of Teach Like a Champion

Facilitator

Bradley Warren, Literacy Coach

Participants

All Faculty and Instructional Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly during PLC Common Planning Time and Bi-Weekly during Whole Group Faculty Meetings.

Evidence of Completion

PLC Agendas/Minutes and Sign-In Sheets; Faculty Meeting Agendas and Sign-In Sheets; Exit Tickets.

PD Opportunity 2

Collaborative Structures Professional Development

Facilitator

core academic trainers and PLC chairs

Participants

all instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Summer Professional Development, July, 2013 - Teachers from each core-academic area were sent to content specific Kagan Structures Training. These "trainers" will use weekly PLC Common Planning Time to train their specific content area on the implementation of these Kagan Structures in their classrooms.

Evidence of Completion

PLC Agendas/minutes and Sign-In Sheets; Documentation of Collaborative Structures on subject-specific Kagan Structures Calendars. Lesson Plan documentation. Observations during weekly administrative classroom walk-through observations and DA Instructional Review walk-through observations.

PD Opportunity 3

Coachng Cycle Training- District Wide

Facilitator

DA team

Participants

District Academic coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

December 16, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Agenda, sign in sheet

PD Opportunity 4

Implement tiered Coaching Cycle

Facilitator

Bradley Warren

Participants

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

January 6, 2014

Evidence of Completion

coaching log, coaching calendar, walk through data

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	All instructional staff will engage in rigorous instruction to increase student achievement and prepare them for college and career readiness.	$24,300
	Total	$24,300

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Other	Professional Development	Total
General Fund Budget	$1,300	$0	$1,300
i3 Grant for Implementation of AVID	$0	$20,000	$20,000
Title I Budget	$0	$3,000	$3,000
Total	$1,300	$23,000	$24,300

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. All instructional staff will engage in rigorous instruction to increase student achievement and prepare them for college and career readiness.

G1.B1 Low Expectations of Students by Staff

G1.B1.S1 Explicit communication of expectations to all instructional staff, with ongoing professional development aligned to areas of need identified by staff survey and student data.

Action Step 2

AVID Professional Development

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

AVID Summer Academy; AVID Pre-School Professional Development; Ongoing AVID Professional Development

Funding Source

i3 Grant for Implementation of AVID

Amount Needed

$20,000

G1.B2 Teachers do not routinely engage in instructional best practices.

G1.B2.S1 Teachers will routinely engage in instructional best practices as evidenced by students collaboratively engaged in rigorous activities and measured by increases in student achievement data.

Action Step 1

Book Study of Teach Like a Champion

Resource Type

Other

Resource

85 copies of Teach Like a Champion

Funding Source

General Fund Budget

Amount Needed

$1,300

Action Step 2

Collaborative Structures Professional Development

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Subject Specific Kagan Structures Professional Development during Summer of 2013

Funding Source

Title I Budget

Amount Needed

$3,000