Hilliard Middle Senior High

2020-21 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: 10/16/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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%)
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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	10%

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 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
Jarrett, Angela	School Counselor	
Harris, Blair	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 10/16/2020, John Crawford

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
45

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	122	126	109	116	104	107	99	783
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	35	22	22	29	23	27	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	1	3	4	0	17
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	7	13	11	5	13	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	6	10	5	10	45

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	8	6	3	10	11	6	8	52

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	3	2	0	3	4	2	3	17

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/16/2020

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	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	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	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

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	122	126	120	114	113	96	77	768
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	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	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

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	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%					
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%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
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%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	69
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	63
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.

Science achievement (both NGSSS and Biology) had the weakest performance at 49%. 2019 achievement declined 13% compared to 2018's performance and was 35% less than the District performance. Contributing factors included the hiring of a new teacher mid-year, lower engagement instruction, and weak collaborative planning.

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

Please see a.

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.

Please see a. Science achievement exceeded the state average in 2018 and then gapped in 2019 by 19%.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile demonstrated the highest gain of 18% between 2018 and 2019. Spiral reviews and intentional progress monitoring efforts contributed to improvement.

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

2019 achievement among black students compared to white peers appeared to be weaker. Black students outperformed ELA learning gains compared to white students, however, performed 14% less in ELA achievement. Math achievement also revealed a disparity between between the two groups where black math achievement was 10% less in Math achievement and learning gains. The largest gap existed within science at 37%. When compared to the District and State, however, black students are on par/exceed achievement.

Black subgroup data is limited year to year due to the small population within our school. Despite this limitation, 2019 data suggests caution when working with this subgroup, ensuring instruction is equitable and tailored to meet the needs of ALL students.

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

The following areas of improvement are identified based on achievement performance and graduation requirement:
1. ELA
2. Algebra 1
3. Science
4. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2018-19 Algebra 1 performance demonstrated improvement from 64% to 87% when compared to the prior year. This 23% increase is partially attributed to curriculum realignment where lower quartile students were assigned an Intensive Math/Algebra 1A course thereby receiving an additional year's worth of instruction and remediation. These students were enrolled in Algebra 1 during 2019-20 but did not take an Algebra 1 EOC due to COVID test waivers. LIkewise, 2019-20 lower quartile students followed the same instructional track. Their curriculum, however, was directly impacted by COVID closures as instruction converted to distance learning. Achievement gaps among remedial/lower quartile students is broader to recover than their on-grade level counterparts. Using September, 2020 STAR ENTERPRISE data, about 30% of 9th/10th grade Algebra 'first-time test-taker' students are demonstrating proficiency with the standards. Comparatively speaking, about 51% of these students earned an achievement level 3 or higher on their 2018-19 FSA Math. Achieving a passing score on the Algebra 1 EOC is a graduation requirement for Florida high school students.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 51% of 9th/10th Grade Algebra students will earn a passing score on the Algebra 1 EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Johnson (johnsonta@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit small group instruction which addresses achievement gaps and reinforces new concepts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With only 30% of students demonstrating proficiency, students need more personalized instruction. Small groups allow for frequent formative assessment of student progress and increase accountability for student engagement. Student engagement with curriculum is essential for learning, especially among struggling learners.

Action Steps to Implement

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In reviewing the English-Language Arts FSA data from the 2018-2019 school year, we noticed that only 55 percent of the current 10th grade cohort met proficiency (Level 3 or higher). Moreover, 42 of 44 students who scored a Level 1 or Level 2 failed to score higher than a 54 percent in the "Key Ideas and Details" cluster of standards.
Measurable Outcome:	The specific measurable outcome we plan to achieve is a 10 percent proficiency increase by this cohort (to 65 percent).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Crawford (crawfordjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy we are currently implementing revolves around spiral review, specifically and intentionally focusing on the Key Ideas and Details cluster. This will be accomplished during small group instruction and during bell work, and will be progressed monitored using district-level common assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

10th grade ELA Teachers will administer common assessments to identify areas for improvement within the Key Ideas and Details cluster of the ELA standards.

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

Teachers will compare data during common planning sessions and share strategies on how best to address areas for improvement.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	8th Grade science performance significantly fell in 2019 with 37% proficiency compared to 63% in 2018. Biology performance was stagnant at 58% proficiency between 2018 and 2019 but lagged significantlly behind the 2019 District average of 84%. Students must be adequately equipped to perform on state assessments as well as have a solid foundation for STEM-based college and career readiness.
Measurable Outcome:	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 is evident and compliments standards-based instruction aligned to the curriculum pacing guide. District progress monitoring assessments are implemented and analyzed for standards mastery and instructional decisions. Teachers participate in instructional rounds to view best instructional practices, receive explicit instructional coaching, and effectively implement recommendations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Aligning instruction directly with prescribed standards, high student engagement, and intentional assessments are best practices for improving achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

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 alignment.
3. Collaborative planning (both intra and intercampus)
4. Test-prep 'boot camp'

Person Responsible   Tammy Johnson (johnsonta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and 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. This is a continuation of the plan created for the 2019-20 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	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 computer 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 lunch with administration. 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 Steps to Implement

1. Device raffle is promoted through various media (announcements, flyers, social media).
2. Attendance clerk tracks absences and provides list of students eligible for raffle tickets to guidance at the end of each month.
3. Students are rewarded quarterly (lunch with admin. or candy).
4. Date selected for end-of-year assembly for device raffle.
5. Guidance and attendance clerk check in on students identified as attendance risks on the district Early Warning System.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The core subject areas of math, ELA, and science are addressed within Areas of Focus.

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.

Develop narrative

Leadership meetings, faculty meetings, MBWA, student interaction, School Advisory Council, student government leaders and committees, community partnerships such as churches, TOH, and rec center, extracurricular booster clubs, multliple stream of communications.

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00