Hilliard Middle Senior High

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hilliard Middle Senior High

1 FLASHES AVE, Hilliard, FL 32046

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: John Crawford

Start Date for this Principal: 9/26/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	53%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Hilliard Middle Senior High

1 FLASHES AVE, Hilliard, FL 32046

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	9%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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.

Hilliard Middle-Senior High School will educate, empower, and enable all students to become caring, contributing citizens who can succeed in an ever-changing world. HMSHS is committed to focusing on high expectations and individual academic success to create a community of respect and responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspire a passion for learning, excellence, and character.

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
Johnson, Tammy	Principal	
Crawford, John	Assistant Principal	
Franzese, Michael	Dean	
Moore, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Coach
Carr, Brooke	School Counselor	
Chaires, Christie	School Counselor	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	104	120	114	113	96	77	751
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	18	19	22	14	17	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4	4	3	1	7	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	7	5	7	12	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	13	15	14	18	13	87

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	8	11	6	11	47

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3	3	19

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
45

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/26/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	67%	65%	56%	62%	62%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	51%	59%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	38%	42%	53%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	81%	64%	51%	70%	54%	49%
Math Learning Gains	67%	54%	48%	62%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	52%	45%	42%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	49%	84%	68%	49%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	80%	73%	76%	80%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	127 (0)	104 (0)	120 (0)	114 (0)	113 (0)	96 (0)	77 (0)	751 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 ()	7 ()	18 ()	19 ()	22 ()	14 ()	17 ()	107 (0)
One or more suspensions	8 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	30 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	12 (0)	37 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	6 (0)	8 (0)	13 (0)	15 (0)	14 (0)	18 (0)	13 (0)	87 (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.

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	70%	63%	7%	54%	16%
	2018	73%	64%	9%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	72%	59%	13%	52%	20%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	51%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	57%	65%	-8%	56%	1%
	2018	73%	68%	5%	58%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
09	2019	69%	65%	4%	55%	14%
	2018	64%	66%	-2%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	61%	64%	-3%	53%	8%
	2018	61%	64%	-3%	53%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	88%	71%	17%	55%	33%
	2018	88%	64%	24%	52%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	86%	76%	10%	54%	32%
	2018	75%	70%	5%	54%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	64%	62%	2%	46%	18%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	45%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	37%	60%	-23%	48%	-11%
	2018	63%	60%	3%	50%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-26%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	58%	84%	-26%	67%	-9%	
2018	58%	80%	-22%	65%	-7%	
Compare		0%				
CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	82%	72%	10%	71%	11%	
2018	60%	67%	-7%	71%	-11%	
Compare		22%				

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	81%	82%	-1%	70%	11%
2018	86%	81%	5%	68%	18%
Compare		-5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	87%	74%	13%	61%	26%
2018	64%	77%	-13%	62%	2%
Compare		23%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	57%	68%	-11%	57%	0%
2018	57%	59%	-2%	56%	1%
Compare		0%			

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 2017-18**	**C & C Accel 2017-18**
SWD	32	53	47	56	62	60	21	44		67	
BLK	54	63		71	58	64	14				
MUL	56	56		79	57						
WHT	68	58	53	82	68	67	51	82	65	91	71
FRL	59	58	53	74	60	63	38	76	63	84	62

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	30	40	30	47	49	34	50	41		100	50
BLK	63	72	46	64	60	33		46		83	30
MUL	77	54		69	50						
WHT	67	60	45	74	64	51	62	73	52	88	73
FRL	61	59	47	69	61	45	58	65	39	79	52

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	19	43	44	37	47	29	5	44		77	10
BLK	45	40		55	45	27	27				
MUL	63	63		75	75						
WHT	63	59	52	70	62	42	50	77	55	87	71
FRL	56	56	53	68	62	50	44	71	41	83	53

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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	750
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Lowest performance occurred in science achievement:
HMSHS achieved 49% as compared to District at 84% and the State at 68%. Our performance declined from 2018's achievement of 62%.

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

See a. Contributing factors included a new teacher hired in February as well as opportunities for stronger instructional implementation.

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.

See a and b. Intensified support and professional development is expected to improve science student achievement.

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

Achievement in math lowest quartile improved 18% from 2018 to 2019. Additional instructional support, progress monitoring, and instructional design contributed to improvement.

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

To date this year, 6th and 12th graders have the highest number of students disciplined for suspensions and approximately 20% of 10th graders have attendance less than 90%.

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

1. Improve science achievement within 8th grade science and Biology
2. While the Lowest quartile achievement within ELA showed improvement, the number of students scoring level 3 or higher with learning gains needs to improve.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improve Science Achievement
Rationale	Science achievement was at its lowest since 2017. Students must be adequately equipped to perform on essential state assessments as well as have a solid foundation for STEM-based college and career readiness.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of students scoring at level 3 or above on both the NGSSS Science Assessment and the Biology 1 EOC resulting in an overall science achievement of at least 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Johnson (johnsonta@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	High engagement instruction (such as Kagan) is evident every day. Standards-based instruction is aligned to the curriculum pacing guide for each lesson. Assessments, including progress monitoring, are aligned to state test specifications and questioning style. Teachers participate in instructional rounds to view best instructional practices and effectively implement recommendations. Explicit instructional coaching for science teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Aligning instruction directly with prescribed standards, high student engagement, and intentional assessments are best practices for improving achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Coaching of instructional best practices which target collaborative learning/high engagement instruction, class environment, and standards-driven planning. 2. Analyze science standards including vertical and horizontal instructional alignment. 3. Collaborative planning (both intra and intercampus) 4. Science events which promote high-interest STEM activities and trips, test-prep tutoring, and family involvement 5.
Person Responsible	Tammy Johnson (johnsonta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains
Rationale	ELA lowest quartile achievement increased from 45 percent to 54 percent. Students achieving level 3 proficiency or higher, however, stagnated at 67 percent, while overall ELA learning gains dropped from 61 percent to 58 percent. We identified 80 students who achieved at achievement level 4 or 5 in 2018 but dropped one or more levels in 2019, which was a major contributor to the overall drop in learning gains.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	* Students achieving at a level 3 or above will increase from 67 to 70 percent. * Overall learning gains will increase from 58 to 63 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Crawford (crawfordjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	* High engagement instruction is evident every day. * Assessments, including progress monitoring, are aligned to state test specifications. * Cold reads are used as common assessments to identify areas of strength and challenges within the standards. * Common planning affords the opportunity for teachers to compare strengths and challenges within the standards and to share best practices. * Standards remediation is offered through computer programs USA Test Prep, Common Lit, and NoRedInk. * Teachers engage in data chats with individual students to identify challenges within the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Performance Matters helped us identify that many of our high-achieving ELA students have decreased in proficiency, which was a major contributor to our overall learning gains dropping by 3 percent from 2018 to 2019. Standards-based instruction with high engagement is scientifically proven to be best practice. This instruction, to be effective, must be planned according to data. The common assessments and data chats will present several opportunities for teachers to identify weaknesses before they are manifested on the high-stakes state test. The intentional standards remediation is intended to fortify these skills before the state test.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify the teachers of the 80 traditionally high-performing students who dropped from a level 5 or 4 in 2019. 2. Identify a day each week for cold reads in all ELA classes. 3. Set aside a period of time each week for teachers to compare cold read results and target areas for improvement. 4. Set aside a period of time after star assessments and common assessments for teachers to have individual data chats with students. 5. Include time for intentional standards remediation each week.

Person Responsible   John Crawford (crawfordjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Average Daily Attendance Below 90%
Rationale	Average Daily Attendance in grades 6-12 saw a modest increase from 2017-2018 (91.3 percent) to 2018-2019 (91.7 percent). Students miss valuable instruction when they are absent from school/class. Research shows that missing 10% of school negatively affects a student's academic performance.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	School-wide Average Daily Attendance will increase to 93 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Crawford (crawfordjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Incentive-based program We will begin to promote an end-of-the-year assembly during which five students will be selected to receive brand new Chromebook devices. Students will be required to miss no more than three days per 9-week period to be eligible for the drawing. Students with perfect attendance will receive five raffle tickets at the conclusion of each term and be invited to a cheeseburger lunch. Those with 1-3 absences will receive three raffle tickets at the conclusion of each term and be rewarded with candy. All students will be invited to the concluding assembly and witness the device raffle. Guidance will work with the attendance clerk to check in with students who have been identified by the Early Warning System for poor attendance. Already in place: Enforcement of district attendance policy, attendance intervention team meetings with students, and quarterly middle school achievement recognition ceremonies during which perfect attendance is rewarded.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows..."that using incentives and a daily check-in system increased attendance, improved academics, and created a sense of belonging. The students were motivated using this approach.

Action Step	
Description	1. Device raffle is promoted through various media (announcements, flyers, social media). 2. Attendance clerk tracks absences and provides list of eligible students to guidance at the end of each quarter. 3. Students are rewarded quarterly (cheeseburger lunch or candy). 4. Date selected for end-of-year assembly for device raffle. 5. Guidance and attendance clerk keep check in on students identified as attendance risks on the Early Warning System.
Person Responsible	John Crawford (crawfordjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Improve Science Achievement**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Average Daily Attendance Below 90%**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**