
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Hardee Junior High School

2401 US HIGHWAY 17 N, Wauchula, FL 33873

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/junior_high

Demographics

Principal: Sheryl Mosley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: D (40%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hardee County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Hardee Junior High School

2401 US HIGHWAY 17 N, Wauchula, FL 33873

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/junior_high

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>73%</p> |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | C | C |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hardee County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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.

Hardee Junior High will provide appropriate and meaningful educational opportunities for our students, so that all may reach their maximum potential, thereby enabling them to become productive and competitive citizens in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Empower and inspire all students for success"

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Mosley, Sheryl | Principal | |
| White, Tracey | Assistant Principal | |
| DeAnda, Lisa | Instructional Coach | Support the MTSS (Rtl) process and Testing Coordinator |
| Kouns, Sherri | Instructional Coach | Support ELA and Social Studies Teachers |
| Shepard, Michelle | Instructional Coach | Support Math and Science Teachers |
| Calvillo, Linda | Teacher, K-12 | ELA Grade Chair- 6th Grade |
| Gough, Melissa | Teacher, K-12 | Math Grade Chair- 7th Grade |
| Jaquez, Elizabeth | School Counselor | |
| Ford, Micaela | Teacher, K-12 | Science Grade Chair- 6th Grade |
| Kelly, Debra | Teacher, K-12 | Science Grade Chair- 7th Grade |
| Kirkland, Missy | Teacher, K-12 | History Grade Chair- 6th Grade |
| Lane, Heather | Teacher, ESE | ESE Department Chair |
| Laughlin, Jacob | Teacher, K-12 | Civics Grade Chair- 7th Grade |
| McGuckin, Kim | Teacher, K-12 | Science Grade Chair- 8th Grade |
| Newman, Sheena | Teacher, K-12 | ELA Grade Chair- 7th Grade |
| Roberts, Erica | Teacher, K-12 | Math Grade Chair- 6th Grade |
| Taylor, Dominique | Teacher, K-12 | Math Grade Chair- 8th Grade |
| Tubbs, Travis | Assistant Principal | |
| Wandrey, Angela | Teacher, K-12 | ELA Grade Chair- 8th Grade |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/1/2020, Sheryl Mosley

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: D (40%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 427 | 407 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1222 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 | 114 | 135 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 390 |

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 | 0 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 427 | 407 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1222 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 | 114 | 135 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 390 |

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 | 0 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 45% | 45% | 54% | 36% | 36% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 47% | 47% | 54% | 39% | 39% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 44% | 47% | 27% | 27% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 56% | 56% | 58% | 45% | 45% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 55% | 55% | 57% | 52% | 52% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 44% | 51% | 44% | 44% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 37% | 37% | 51% | 34% | 34% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 61% | 61% | 72% | 37% | 37% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (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 | 2019 | 47% | 47% | 0% | 54% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 42% | 0% | 52% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 38% | 38% | 0% | 52% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 38% | 1% | 51% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 49% | 48% | 1% | 56% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 44% | 0% | 58% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 44% | 44% | 0% | 55% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 45% | 1% | 52% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 59% | 59% | 0% | 54% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 47% | 0% | 54% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 55% | 53% | 2% | 46% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 40% | 0% | 45% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 37% | 36% | 1% | 48% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 41% | 0% | 50% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 60% | 59% | 1% | 71% | -11% |
| 2018 | 49% | 48% | 1% | 71% | -22% |
| Compare | | 11% | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 99% | 53% | 46% | 61% | 38% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 99% | 69% | 30% | 62% | 37% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

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 | 22 | 38 | 33 | 25 | 45 | 47 | 15 | 36 | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 41 | 46 | 36 | 33 | 30 | 20 | 44 | | | |
| ASN | 30 | 40 | | 60 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 41 | 39 | 46 | 58 | 52 | 26 | 67 | 42 | | |
| HSP | 42 | 44 | 44 | 52 | 51 | 42 | 31 | 57 | 55 | | |
| MUL | 32 | 33 | | 47 | 61 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 58 | 49 | 69 | 65 | 44 | 60 | 72 | 63 | | |
| FRL | 38 | 44 | 43 | 49 | 52 | 43 | 29 | 58 | 51 | | |
| 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 | 15 | 40 | 34 | 19 | 38 | 30 | 20 | 22 | | | |
| ELL | 14 | 35 | 35 | 27 | 41 | 44 | 18 | 22 | | | |
| ASN | 10 | 27 | | 60 | 45 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 54 | 46 | 40 | 43 | 36 | 32 | 45 | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 54 | 45 | 44 | 48 | 39 | 42 | 44 | 49 | | |
| MUL | 58 | 53 | | 50 | 35 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 53 | 44 | 58 | 55 | 39 | 49 | 64 | 58 | | |
| FRL | 38 | 52 | 46 | 43 | 46 | 37 | 40 | 46 | 47 | | |
| 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 | 7 | 15 | 14 | 12 | 32 | 33 | 3 | 18 | | | |
| ELL | 3 | 18 | 15 | 15 | 38 | 44 | | 6 | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 33 | 36 | 33 | 53 | 50 | 25 | 33 | | | |
| HSP | 30 | 35 | 24 | 42 | 50 | 41 | 27 | 35 | 51 | | |
| MUL | 48 | 46 | | 44 | 56 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 47 | 31 | 53 | 57 | 51 | 48 | 43 | 59 | | |
| FRL | 29 | 35 | 26 | 39 | 48 | 40 | 29 | 31 | 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) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 496 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 36 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 45 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 45 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 46 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 43 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 60 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 46 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The data component that performed the lowest was eighth grade Science. Based on 2018-2019 school data, student achievement within eighth grade Science decreased by 6% based on 2018-2019 data reports. Based on the data report it is difficult at this time to determine if this is a trend in data. Contributing factors to last year's low performance include lack of curriculum planning and professional learning communities among teachers. Lack of standards aligned curriculum and data driven instruction.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is in the area of ELA learning gains. In the 2018 school year student performance in ELA was 54% which declined to 47% ELA for the 2019 school year. School data indicates a 7% decline for ELA learning gains. Possible contributing factors include lack of small group targeted instruction, authentic tier 2/tier 3 services and curriculum aligned to Florida Standards.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to state average was eighth grade Science. According to 2019 student performance in Science was a 37% and the state average was 51%. Based on school data Science was 14% below the state average. Contributing factors to last year's low performance include lack of curriculum planning and professional learning communities among teachers. Curriculum not aligned to standards and benchmark data not used to drive instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Civics, indicating a 11% overall increase from the 2018 school year. Prior school data from the 2018 school year indicates a 12% increase from the 2017 school year. Student growth and achievement in the area of Civics continues to be on an upward trend. New actions for the 2019 school year in the area of Civics included:
 Professional Learning Community Standards based instruction
 Curriculum planning and alignment
 Continuous monitoring of student growth and achievement
 Benchmarks for progress monitoring
 Data chats with academic coaches

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on 2018-2019 school data, student achievement within eighth grade Science decreased by 6%.

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

1. Science Grade 8-Student Growth and Achievement
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. Math Student Growth and Achievement
4. ELL and Migrant Student Growth and Achievement
5. ESE Student Growth and Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student performance on the Grade 8 Science EOC Assessment continues to fall well below the state average. Based on last year's 2019 school data, Grade 8 Science is 14% below the state average.

Measurable Outcome: 50% of eighth grade students taking NGSS 2.0 EOC exam will score a level 3 or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Shepard (mshepard@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Development of a standards based curriculum pacing guide and standards based benchmarks for progress monitoring of student growth and achievement

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we increase teacher's knowledge and understanding of the standards and the level of rigor required for the EOC then they will be able to develop a fluid standards based pacing guide. Teachers can continue making adjustments to their instruction and pacing guide while participating in their Professional Learning Community and Data Chats with Academic Coach. Teachers will use standards based benchmarks to monitor student growth and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

To address student performance on the Science EOC, HJH will implement the following initiatives:

1. Science Curriculum & Best Practices professional development with Academic Coach.
2. Develop a curriculum pacing guide aligned to standards.
3. Ongoing alignment of instructional materials and curriculum pacing guide to standards.
4. Designated common planning time for Professional Learning Communities
5. Standards based benchmarks for monitoring student growth and achievement 3 times per year
6. Monthly data chat with Academic Coach
7. Use of USA Test Prep

Person Responsible: Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although student performance on the FSA ELA Assessment increased by 2%, there is still a need for student growth and achievement. 2019 school data indicates the students are performing 9% below the state average and ELA learning gains declined by 7% overall.

Measurable Outcome: 54% of students taking the FSA ELA Assessment will make a learning gain.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sherri Kouns (skouns@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Development of a standards based curriculum pacing guide and standards based benchmarks for progress monitoring of student growth and achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we increase teachers' knowledge and understanding of the standards and the level of rigor required for the FSA ELA assessment then they will be able to develop a fluid standards based curriculum pacing guide. Teachers can continue making adjustments to their instruction and pacing guide while participating in their Professional Learning Community and Data Chats with Literacy Coach. Teachers will use the district diagnostic to determine student growth and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

To address student performance on the ELA FSA Assessment, HJH will implement the following initiatives:

1. ELA Curriculum & Best Practices professional development with Academic Coach.
2. Develop a curriculum pacing guide aligned to Florida Standards.
3. Ongoing alignment of instructional materials and curriculum pacing guide to Florida Standards.
4. Designated common planning time for Professional Learning Communities
5. Diagnostic benchmarks to monitor student progress
6. Monthly data chat with Literacy Coach
7. Small group targeted instruction
8. Monthly Cold Reads for progress monitoring
9. Weekly I-Ready usage time of 45+ minutes
10. Tier 2 Instructional ELA Block with research based instruction
11. Tier 3 Reading Intervention class with research based instruction
12. Problem Solving Team meetings to determine additional supports for struggling students.
13. After-school program
14. Updated School Reading Plan and Assessment Decision Tree

Person Responsible: Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although student performance on the FSA Math Assessment increased by 8%, there is still a need for student growth and achievement. 2019 school data indicates the students are performing 2% below the state average despite a 6% increase from the 2018 school year. Students in the lowest quartile are 7% below the state average despite a 6% increase from the 2018 school year.

Measurable Outcome: 51% of students taking the FSA Math Assessment will make a level 3 or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Shepard (mshepard@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Development of a standards based curriculum pacing guide and standards based mini-assessments for progress monitoring of student growth and achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we increase teachers' knowledge and understanding of the standards and the level of rigor required for the FSA Math assessment then they will be able to develop a fluid standards based curriculum pacing guide. Teachers can continue making adjustments to their instruction and pacing guide while participating in their Professional Learning Community and Data Chats with Academic Coach. Teachers will use the district diagnostic to determine student growth and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

To address student performance on the Math FSA Assessment, HJH will implement the following initiatives:

1. Math Curriculum & Best Practices professional development with Academic Coach.
2. Develop a curriculum pacing guide aligned to Florida Standards.
3. Ongoing alignment of instructional materials and curriculum pacing guide to Florida Standards.
4. Designated common planning time for Professional Learning Communities
5. I-Ready Diagnostic benchmarks to monitor student progress
6. Monthly data chat with Math Coach
7. Small group targeted instruction
8. Standards based mini-assessments for progress monitoring through UNIFY
9. Weekly I-Ready usage time of 45+ minutes
10. Tier 3 Math Intensive Block with research based instruction
11. Problem Solving Team meetings to determine additional supports for struggling students.
12. After-school program

Person Responsible Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although student performance on the Civics EOC assessment increased by 11% for the 2019 school year and 12% for the 2018 school year, there is still a need for growth. School data indicates that students are performing 11% below the state average.

Measurable Outcome: 72% of students taking the Civics EOC will score a level 3 or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sherri Kouns (skouns@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Development of a standards based curriculum pacing guide and standards based benchmarks for progress monitoring of student growth and achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we increase teacher's knowledge and understanding of the standards and the level of rigor required for the EOC then they will be able to develop a fluid standards based pacing guide. Teachers can continue making adjustments to their instruction and pacing guide while participating in their Professional Learning Community and Data Chats with Academic Coach. Teachers will use standards based benchmarks to monitor student growth and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

To address student performance on the Civics EOC, HJH will implement the following initiatives:

1. Civics Curriculum & Best Practices professional development with Academic Coach.
2. Develop a curriculum pacing guide aligned to standards.
3. Ongoing alignment of instructional materials and curriculum pacing guide to standards.
4. Designated common planning time for Professional Learning Communities
5. Standards based benchmarks for monitoring student growth and achievement
6. Monthly data chat with Academic Coach
7. Standards based mini-assessment administered quarterly in order to monitor student proficiency levels

Person Responsible: Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Based on 2019 statewide assessments in reading, math, science and Civics, students in our ELL and SWD subgroups scored significantly below their peers. Students in the subgroups fell 2% in ELA learning gains for SWD, 8% in Math learning gains for ELL students, and 5% in Science for SWD when compared to 2018 student performance. Overall, SWD and ELL students increased their performance on statewide assessments for the 2019 school year.

Area of Focus 2019

Description and Rationale: School Year ELL SWD
 ELA- 45% 24% 22%
 ELA LG- 47% 41% 38%
 Math- 56% 36% 25%
 Math LG- 55% 33% 45%
 Science- 37% 20% 15%
 Civics- 61% 44% 36%

Measurable Outcome: SWD will increase their learning gains on the ELA FSA test by 15%. ELL students will increase their learning gains by 15% on the Math FSA test.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide training for all instructional staff in the areas of ELL and SWD while providing research based instructional materials and teaching strategies. Plan for RtI instructional time outside of tier 1 instruction for tier 2 and tier 3 students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we provide additional targeted support through research based resources, instructional programs and instructional staff training then student learning gains in Math and ELA should improve. These resources and programs include Rosetta Stone, Imagine Learning, ELL and Migrant paraprofessionals, site based ELL/Migrant based student services and I-Ready (Aligned to WIDA Standards).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff members will participate in ELL training with suggestions for classroom strategies and resources.
2. Staff members will receive training in Reading Disabilities and Dyslexia with suggestions for best practices.
3. Rosetta Stone for English Language acquisition.
4. I-Ready Diagnostic for progress monitoring and interventions in math and ELA.
5. Response to Intervention- Additional 50 minutes of targeted instruction for tier 2 and tier 3 ELA students.
6. RtI- Additional 50 minutes of targeted instruction for tier 3 Math students.
7. ELL after school instruction
8. Imagine Learning-Online PreK–8 Literacy, Math, and Assessment solutions grounded in language development.
9. Site based ELL/Migrant paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

In addition to these areas of concern, we also recognize that truancy and behavior are a concern. Last year we implemented a mentoring program called Check & Connect. Check & Connect is a data driven intervention program that targets tier 2 students with academic, behavior and truancy concerns. This year our goal is to reduce the number of days students are absent or miss instruction due to ISS or OSS. Last year, our goal was for students to reduce the number of days absent from 15 or more to 10 or less days absent. 62% of our students targeted last year met this goal. We will continue with this same goal for the 2019-2020 school year with the same group of students and some additional new students. This school year we have also added a Credit Recovery class through Edmentum for students who did not pass their English Language Arts, Math, Science or Social Studies classes.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |