Nassau County School District

# 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<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (68%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)<br>2016-17: A (62%)<br>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<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (68%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)<br>2016-17: A (62%)<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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<br>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.<br>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<br>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** |