Hill Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hill Middle School

5200 EHRLICH RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ronald Mason   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Hill Middle School

5200 EHRLICH RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.

Hill Middle School will prepare all students to achieve their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Use respect, responsibility and relationships to foster student achievement.

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
Mason, Ronald	Principal	
Dudley, Ray	Assistant Principal	
Stover, Kelly	Assistant Principal	
Goldman, Brittany	SAC Member	
Lindsey, Teryl	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ronald Mason

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.*
5

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.*
21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
72

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	217	211	212	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	64	71	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	9	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	7	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	57	52	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	81	60	0	0	0	0	197

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	4	32	22	0	0	0	0	58

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	12	27	31	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	59%	51%	54%	55%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	52%	54%	54%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	47%	47%	48%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	65%	55%	58%	66%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	67%	57%	57%	72%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	52%	51%	62%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	53%	47%	51%	45%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	67%	72%	71%	66%	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	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
	2018	53%	52%	1%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	54%	2%	52%	4%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
	2018	45%	48%	-3%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	63%	62%	1%	54%	9%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	54%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	41%	31%	10%	46%	-5%
	2018	43%	29%	14%	45%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	51%	47%	4%	48%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	78%	67%	11%	71%	7%
2018	71%	65%	6%	71%	0%
Compare		7%			

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	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
2018	98%	63%	35%	62%	36%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

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	16	40	38	21	53	54	11	55			
ELL	25	51	55	38	55	48	31	60	79		

	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
ASN	77	66		84	80		71	95	93		
BLK	42	53	48	48	66	69	36	84	95		
HSP	52	58	53	59	65	52	44	72	90		
MUL	70	58		77	64	64	75	85	100		
WHT	69	65	58	74	69	66	67	91	95		
FRL	52	57	49	58	65	55	48	77	90		
	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	12	41	44	22	47	44	19	35	67		
ELL	28	54	52	35	58	56	24	45	82		
ASN	80	58		85	70		100	81	100		
BLK	47	58	70	55	69	64	35	67	82		
HSP	50	55	47	59	63	54	44	67	95		
MUL	63	65		73	62						
WHT	62	59	57	68	69	69	57	85	93		
FRL	49	54	48	59	65	57	42	69	92		
	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	9	34	33	25	55	56	8	40			
ELL	27	55	51	36	59	54	13	42			
ASN	72	80		86	91		46	91	100		
BLK	39	42	31	50	68	61	41	59	92		
HSP	51	53	48	63	69	61	43	68	91		
MUL	46	55		71	83						
WHT	63	54	50	71	73	67	49	73	91		
FRL	46	51	47	59	69	59	39	59	90		

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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	664
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	81
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	60
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	62
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	74
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	73
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	62
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.

Based on the ESSA Data, the federal index for students with disabilities (SWD) is 36%. The other subgroups in the school have a federal index between 52%-81%. SWD are significantly less, which indicates the need for extra support for this subgroup.

Our subgroup federal index for SWD has been within a percentage point the last two school years. Factors that may have contributed are varying instructional materials and differentiation of instruction.

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

Based on the FLDOE 2017-2018 and 2019-2020 report card, there was minimal decline within the subgroups. There was no more than a 1% decline within the subgroups. The subgroups that declined by 1% were Black students, Asian students, ELLs, and SWD.

These declines were minimal; however, there may be factors that contributed to the decline such as resources at home, family involvement, home life, late buses, attendance, etc.

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 greatest gap between Hill Middle School and the state of Florida is the percentage of students proficient in science. In the 2018-2019 school year, 53.1% of students were proficient in science; whereas, at the state level, 57.8% of students were proficient in science.

The 2017-2017 data shows that Hill is on an upward trend in science proficiency. Science proficiency was at 50.4% for that school year; whereas, the state declined approximately a percentage point from 2017-2018 (58.6%) to 2018-2019 (57.8).

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

The subgroup that showed the most improvement from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year were multiracial students. The federal index increased from 66% to 74%.

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

One area of concern based on the EWS data from Part 1 (D) is regarding the course failures in Language Arts. For the three grade levels, there are 47 course failures in ELA, which correlates with 59% students scoring a 3+ on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA.

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

1. Increase learning gains for all students in Language Arts from a 59% to a 62%, which would bring the content area grade to an "A" in the FLDOE school report cards.
2. Increase learning gains for the lower quartile students in Language Arts from a 53% to a 57%, which would bring the content area grade to an "B" in the FLDOE school report cards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus for school year is to improve learning gains for all students in Language Arts as indicated by the 2020-2021 FSA ELA. There will be an emphasis on increasing learning gains for lower quartile students.
Measurable Outcome:	We intend to increase learning gains for all students in Language Arts from a 59% to a 62%. According to the FLDOE report card, a 62% or higher constitutes as a school grade of an "A" in that content area. Additionally, the lower quartile students will increase learning gains in Language Arts from a 53% to a 57%, which would constitute as a school grade of a "B" for that subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Clear learning targets 2. School-wide use of terminology 3. High interest texts 4. Instructional frameworks
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The "Academic Moves" levels/verbiage will not only ensure that students understand the purpose of their learning, but it will also allow educators to successfully scaffold content. The "Academic Moves" levels/verbiage assists educators in moving from more simplistic learning targets to more rigorous learning targets. 2. The use of school-wide terminology, such as CCC terms, is to show students the terminology is relevant and synonymous in Reading and Language Arts classrooms. This reinforcement of vocabulary will help them with the writing portion of Language Arts exam. 3. The high-interest texts focuses on the reading portion of Language Arts. When students have autonomy in their reading selections, they are more likely to be engaged. This can be applied across content areas through independent reading, literature circles, or school-wide initiatives. 4. Instructional frameworks will be implemented across content areas. Specifically, in Language Arts, lessons will be created to support small group rotations and the "I do, you do, we do" strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

An informal training on "Academic Moves" will be scheduled early in the school year. This will introduce teachers to each "move" or level of learning and how they can introduce those "moves" to students.

Person Responsible Ronald Mason (ronald.mason@hcps.net)

Teachers will be given the print out from "Academic Moves" of the various levels of learning with the verbiage that corresponds with each level. This will assist with lesson planning. This can posted in the classroom, so students can see how their learning progresses regarding a topic.

Person Responsible Teryl Lindsey (teryl.lindsey@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

In order to make the writing process more clear and more cohesive throughout school, ELA teachers can ensure other subject area teachers (such as reading) understand the CCC writing method. This will allow the students to focus on the content of their writing rather than the terminology between classes.

Person Responsible   Teryl Lindsey (teryl.lindsey@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Lists can be created for each content area of high-interest books to introduce to students. The books will be relevant to the course. Teachers can incorporate independent reading assignments or literature circles on the texts.

Person Responsible   Teryl Lindsey (teryl.lindsey@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

The instructional frameworks will be monitored and observed to ensure that it is being implemented in the Language Arts classrooms with fidelity.

Person Responsible   Ronald Mason (ronald.mason@hcps.net)

The teachers will receive an informal follow-up training on the instructional frameworks. This training will be reinforced by the subject area leaders, who will then disperse the information to their department for reinforcement.

Person Responsible   Ray Dudley (ray.dudley@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Both "Academic Moves" to increase complexity over time and the introduction of high-interest, content-related texts can assist in increasing gains in science. The focus on Language Arts, through implementation of the instructional frameworks, will assist in making gains for our ESE students. In the 2018-2019 school year, only 16% were proficient in this area and only 40% made learning gains.

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.

Hill Middle School's SAC aims to involve various stakeholders to assist in meeting students' needs and helping students' academically succeed. Typically, the meetings consist of administration, teachers, guidance counselors, and parents.

Additionally, there are several events that we encourage parents to attend, such as open house, conference nights, chorus/band/orchestra concerts, and AVID events.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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