Hernando High School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hernando High School

700 BELL AVE, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/hhs

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK, 6-12	No	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	C	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Leopard Pride in all things. Bring it!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will graduate all students prepared to go to work or college.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Booker, Leechele	Principal
Miller, Angela	Assistant Principal
Kavanagh, Loren	Teacher, K-12
Platt, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12
Fields, Lorenzo	Assistant Principal
O'Rourke, Dan	Assistant Principal
Davis, Susan	Dean
Greene, Janice	School Counselor
Swackard, Arleatha	Other

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The School Based Leadership Team meets bi-weekly to discuss student data as it relates to their particular responsibility. Susan Davis, Dean, discusses the behavioral MTSS process as well any students receiving added behavioral interventions. Janice Greene provides updates on the Guidance Department and anything that corresponds to its day to day functions, for example: scheduling, testing, counseling, etc. Administrators work with individual grade levels and report on the progress of students both academically and behaviorally. Mr. O'Rourke oversees ninth grade, Mr. Fields tenth and Mrs. Miller Royal eleventh. The three administrators split the alphabet of the senior class.
The Assessment Coordinator shares upcoming testing dates and any related issues pertaining to testing. Principal and Assistant Principals discuss progress of mentored students and the status of individual departments.
Mrs. Booker, Principal, covers any pertinent items on the agenda that need to be addressed,

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	0	0	0	129	6	5	8	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	14	22	9	80
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	45	49	39	168
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	171	144	120	509
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	92	88	51	341

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected
Tuesday 8/28/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	0	0	0	82	91	85	66	324
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	10	24	13	78
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	61	57	25	229
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	97	99	54	368

Year 2016-17 - 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	0	0	0	90	101	48	65	304
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	10	24	13	78
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	61	57	25	229
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	146	134	110	505

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	97	99	54	368

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA Lowest 25th percentile. Yes, it decreased from 33% to 31% from 2017-2018 and is a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA Lowest 25th percentile, Math Achievement and Math Learning Gains all decreased 2%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Math Learning Gains showed a 24% gap compared to the state.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math Lowest 25th Percentile had a 6% improvement. This does not appear to be a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Algebra A/B blocks and Geometry classrooms utilized Math Nation with fidelity. Geometry and Algebra 1 progress monitoring was tracked via the SWAP process. Instructional implications were discussed weekly and standards-based instruction was the expectation. Co-teachers in Geometry and Algebra 1 have become more confident in delivering mathematical content.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	62%	60%	37%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	52%	57%	32%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	48%	52%	31%	45%	49%
Math Achievement	40%	68%	61%	39%	67%	56%
Math Learning Gains	34%	63%	58%	34%	62%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	57%	52%	32%	58%	48%
Science Achievement	65%	63%	57%	64%	57%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	82%	77%	63%	82%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	129 (82)	6 (91)	5 (85)	8 (66)	148 (324)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	35 (31)	14 (10)	22 (24)	9 (13)	80 (78)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	35 (86)	45 (61)	49 (57)	39 (25)	168 (229)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	74 (0)	171 (0)	144 (0)	120 (0)	509 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018					
	2017	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2018	43%	50%	-7%	53%	-10%
	2017	40%	46%	-6%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		43%				
10	2018	40%	48%	-8%	53%	-13%
	2017	36%	42%	-6%	50%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018					
	2017	0%	53%	-53%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	64%	58%	6%	65%	-1%
2017	60%	67%	-7%	63%	-3%
Compare		4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	62%	68%	-6%	68%	-6%
2017	59%	69%	-10%	67%	-8%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	37%	62%	-25%	62%	-25%
2017	42%	59%	-17%	60%	-18%
Compare		-5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	42%	45%	-3%	56%	-14%
2017	43%	50%	-7%	53%	-10%
Compare		-1%			

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	37	35	29	41		33	14		73	21
ELL	24	35	30	18	25						
BLK	26	27	19	14	30	38	35	30		68	33
HSP	33	40	41	27	25	24	62	57		70	58
MUL	58	53		41	35						
WHT	47	42	31	47	36	38	68	68		82	67
FRL	41	41	30	35	32	35	57	53		70	53

2017 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	8	18	13	17	24	21	21	25		63	30
ELL	21	33		25	23						
BLK	15	31	25	14	24	31	27	33		86	33
HSP	38	38	43	41	44	47	58	50		81	27
MUL				43	33			64			
WHT	42	43	36	45	37	26	65	62		79	59
FRL	30	36	32	38	37	29	53	53		72	43

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Literacy Across All Content Areas
Rationale	Based on ELA school data we are embracing a school-wide effort to increase literacy and student achievement in all areas.
Intended Outcome	Increase ELA Achievement by 3%, ELA Learning Gains by 4% and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile by 5% and an increase in overall achievement in all subject areas.
Point Person	Angela Miller (miller_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Literacy Leadership Team will meet bi-weekly to share best practices and reflections based on departmental feedback in reference to reading strategies implemented from Professional Development provided by Maria Jorif, Secondary District Reading Coach. Teachers will provide student work samples and share instructional implications as it pertains to reading strategies. Additional English Language Arts/Reading Professional Development will be proved twice per semester by Core Connections. Chris Lewis from Core Connections will lead this training. In addition to the Literacy Leadership Team, professional learning communities will continue to focus on the Student Work Analysis Protocol (SWAP) process with continued monitoring of standard-based instruction with emphasis from History and Science addressing literacy standards.
Person Responsible	Angela Miller (miller_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Administration will conduct ongoing classroom walk-throughs. Mr. O'Rourke will oversee Mathematics, Science and Performing Arts. Mrs. Miller-Royal will oversee English and Reading. Mr. Fields will oversee Career Technical Education, Social Studies, ROTC and Physical Education. For teachers who are struggling with implementation of the Literacy Team initiatives, "Just in Time Professional Development" will be offered. This will be handled in a teacher conference. Administrators will also review lesson plans to observe the effectiveness of the specific strategies. Administrators will require Lesson Plans be provided bi-weekly.
Person Responsible	Angela Miller (miller_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Mathematics Learning Gains of the Lowest 25 Percent
Rationale	A focus on the Mathematics Lowest 25th Percentile may have a positive effect on Learning Gains and Achievement.
Intended Outcome	2018-2019 goal for the Mathematics Lowest 25th Percentile is a 5% increase from 36% (2017-2018) to 41% and overall math achievement (2018-2019).
Point Person	Dan O'Rourke (orourke_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	1) Cap all Algebra A/B classes at 20 students. 2) Co-teachers are trained on the mathematics content and will receive Professional Development for highly effective co-teaching strategies. 3) Peer Inclusion Team (PIT Crew) students are in all Algebra A/B blocks. These are typically juniors and seniors who have met their graduation requirements and are historically successful in Mathematics. There are typically one to three of these mentors in each Algebra A/B block as well as Geometry class. 4) ALEKS progress monitoring system in place for student access twice per week. All Algebra 1A/B blocks are equipped with appropriate technology to implement this program. ALEKS is "Assessment and LEarning in Knowledge Spaces". It is a web-based, artificially intelligent assessment and learning system. ALEKS uses adaptive questioning to quickly and accurately determine exactly what a student knows and doesn't know in a course. ALEKS then instructs the student on the topics he/she is most ready to learn. As a student works through a course, ALEKS periodically reassesses the student to ensure that topics learned are also retained. ALEKS courses are very complete in their topic coverage and ALEKS avoids multiple-choice questions. A student who shows a high level of mastery of an ALEKS course will be successful in the actual course he/she is taking.
Person Responsible	Dan O'Rourke (orourke_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	For all students, progress monitoring is overseen by administration. Mr. O'Rourke has administrative access to the ALEKS program and can monitor student progress. Teachers will monitor student progress daily through ALEKS. In addition to progress monitoring, administration will perform frequent classroom walkthroughs. All administrators will look for the standards posted on the wall along with the related Essential Question. Mathematics classes will follow the district curriculum calendar. The standard reflected should correspond to the calendar topic for the day. Teacher data chats will be used to track students who are performing in the Lowest 25th Percentile.
Person Responsible	Dan O'Rourke (orourke_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)