Hamilton County High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hamilton County High School

5683 US HIGHWAY 129 S, Jasper, FL 32052

http://hch.hamiltonfl.com

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Mitchell

Start Date for this Principal: 9/27/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Hamilton 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.](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

Hamilton County High School

5683 US HIGHWAY 129 S, Jasper, FL 32052

http://hch.hamiltonfl.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hamilton 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.

Hamilton County High School's mission is to provide all students with a quality, well-rounded education that will enable them to become productive citizens in an ever-changing global society. We will also team with parents, community, and local businesses to challenge our students to be creative, to foster a respectful attitude for themselves, and to help them experience the joy of life and a love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hamilton County High School will produce, through a rigorous curriculum, prepared young adults who are creative, individual learners, and productive citizens of society. Each individual will be prepared to enter college, trade/vocational school, or the work force with tools needed to be successful..

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harrison, Donald	Principal	Each member of the school based leadership team serves a vital role in ensuring that the lines of communication are open between administration and staff as well as making decisions that affect school-based activities throughout the year. Principal Harrison is responsible for all aspects of school operations. As the instructional leader of the school, the principal is also responsible for making curriculum decisions that promote student success as well as support instructional growth of teachers. Mr. Harrison and Mr. Ryan Mitchell is responsible for professional development as it relates to the SIP. The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.
Mitchell, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Each member of the school based leadership team serves a vital role in ensuring that the lines of communication are open between administration and staff as well as making decisions that affect school-based activities throughout the year. Mr. Mitchell is in charge of the curriculum, professional development, staff evaluations. The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.
Harris, Phyllis	Other	Each member of the school based leadership team serves a vital role in ensuring that the lines of communication are open between administration and staff as well as making decisions that affect school-based activities throughout the year. Mrs. Harris is responsible for assessment. The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.
Mitchell, Elizabeth	School Counselor	Each member of the school based leadership team serves a vital role in ensuring that the lines of communication are open between administration and staff as well as making decisions that affect school-based activities throughout the year. Mrs. Elizabeth Mitchell is responsible for assisting students with graduation requirements and guidance throughout the year. The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.
Deas, Brianne	Teacher, K-12	Each member of the school based leadership team serves a vital role in ensuring that the lines of communication are open between administration and staff as well as making decisions that affect school-based activities throughout the year. Mrs. Brianne Deas is the Chair of the SAC and is a classroom teacher and parent. She provides valuable knowledge to the leadership team. The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.
Slone, Arie	Dean	The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements. Mr. Slone is the High School Dean and is responsible for campus discipline in grades 9-12. The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.
Kinard, Mary	Dean	The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements. Ms. Kinard is the Middle School Dean and is responsible for campus discipline in grades 7-8. The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.
Daniels, Louis	Instructional Coach	The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Mr. Daniels assists with each department for professional development as it relates to the SIP. He also assists with the needs of each department for textbooks and curriculum. The Leadership Team clearly communicates to their departments expectations for student academic and social growth. Decisions by the team are data-driven, collaborative, and consensus oriented. The work of the team is driven by the short and long-range goals of the school as expressed through the SIP, Mission and Vision statements.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 9/27/2018, Ryan Mitchell

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
50

Total number of students enrolled at the school
716

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	130	135	123	109	91	716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	47	41	39	41	25	230
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	120	53	39	24	8	298
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	6	7	6	3	41
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5	3	3	4	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	44	61	49	46	33	281
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	42	64	15	27	8	200
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	38	39	47	48	46	33	251

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	8	0	0	5	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/27/2021

2020-21 - 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	113	165	109	110	105	72	674
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	44	31	29	43	11	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	56	35	40	0	0	162
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	52	21	9	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	1	1	5	10

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	7	24	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	10	6	9	8	46

2020-21 - 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	113	165	109	110	105	72	674
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	44	31	29	43	11	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	56	35	40	0	0	162
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	52	21	9	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	1	1	5	10

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	7	24	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	10	6	9	8	46

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				30%		56%	30%		56%
ELA Learning Gains				38%		51%	47%		53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29%		42%	40%		44%
Math Achievement				37%		51%	36%		51%
Math Learning Gains				42%		48%	48%		48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%		45%	44%		45%
Science Achievement				39%		68%	42%		67%
Social Studies Achievement				42%		73%	49%		71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	0%	33%	-33%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	28%	28%	0%	52%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	32%	33%	-1%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
09	2021					
	2019	38%	38%	0%	55%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
10	2021					
	2019	17%	17%	0%	53%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	14%	14%	0%	54%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	35%	35%	0%	46%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	25%	26%	-1%	48%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	49%	48%	1%	67%	-18%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	38%	38%	0%	71%	-33%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	43%	43%	0%	70%	-27%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	32%	31%	1%	61%	-29%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	55%	55%	0%	57%	-2%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

For grades 7 and 8, HCHS uses iReady for Math and ELA diagnostics 3 times a year. Students are also assessed using district created exams in Unify through the Performance Matters platform. These assessments are given quarterly, each being comprehensive from the beginning of the school year to the time they are given. The third and final quarterly exam is completely comprehensive and is given prior to the FSA/EOC at the end of the third quarter.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	127 / 44%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	16 / 13%		
	English Language Learners	11 / 0%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	127 / 9%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	13 / 8%		
	English Language Learners	10 / 0%		

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	106 / 38%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 40%		
	English Language Learners	8 / 25%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	109/ 16%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 20%		
	English Language Learners	8 / 13%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	109 / 28%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21 / 14%		
	English Language Learners	18 / 6%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48 / 58%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 0%		
	English Language Learners	2 / 0%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	22 / 95%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	124 / 36%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8 / 13%		
	English Language Learners	12 / 0%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	101 / 25%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8 / 25%		
	English Language Learners	12 / 0%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	98 / 43%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	6 / 33%		
	English Language Learners	12 / 33%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	7 / 43%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 0%		
	English Language Learners	0		

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75 / 30%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9 / 11%		
	English Language Learners	8 / 13%		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34 / 9%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8 / 0%		
	English Language Learners	5 / 20%		
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5 / 20%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 25%		
	English Language Learners	1 / 0%		
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	92 / 34%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 27%		
	English Language Learners	9 / 11%		

Grade 11					
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	38 / 29%			
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 0%			
	English Language Learners	1 / 0%			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	29			
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities	6			
	English Language Learners	0			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	1 / 0%			
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities	0			
	English Language Learners	0			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	2			
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities	0			
	English Language Learners	0			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	34	29	16	41	43	19	17		92	9
ELL	12	20	20	7	16	27	8	39			
BLK	20	31	27	17	26	26	14	19	23	91	26
HSP	21	26	17	18	20	25	24	49	29	93	38
MUL	18			13	20						

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
WHT	40	41	32	43	30	36	47	57	58	87	61
FRL	20	30	26	21	25	30	20	34	31	87	37

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	23	22	10	29	52		30	31			
ELL	16	41		30	42		23	30			
BLK	14	29	30	18	38	50	23	32	60	67	52
HSP	30	46	27	43	43		44	34		58	
MUL	40	40		42	40						
WHT	43	41	21	51	45	48	52	55	63	84	81
FRL	26	36	30	32	41	55	36	34	67	75	64

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	16	26	15	22	31	31	28	33			
ELL	9	32		27	33			37			
BLK	19	42	33	17	34	40	24	34	50	68	20
HSP	26	42	50	44	57		36	48	91		
MUL	41	71		36	50		50	69			
WHT	40	50	50	51	55	55	58	64	83	71	54
FRL	25	46	39	29	42	39	34	46	75	53	28

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	20
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	17
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

One of the trends that emerged was a decrease in proficiency and learning gains in ELA and Mathematics, specifically with regards to the bottom quartile at each grade/subject. For instance, in ELA, the overall learning gains and learning gains among the bottom quartile dropped 4 points a piece. More alarming is the overall drop in learning gains in math: Overall gains decreased 17 points and bottom quartile learning gains decreased 24 points. Two of our EOCs were trending positively as both Algebra 1 and US History showed gains while Geometry showed a 30 point decrease. Students with disabilities at HCHS stayed consistent with learning gains in ELA but the SWD population experienced a swift decline among learning gains in the bottom quartile. With regards to subgroups, both our black and SWD populations experienced over 60% of students in each subgroup in level 1 for both ELA and Mathematics.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest needs for improvement lie in learning gains for both Math and ELA. Increased proficiency in both areas is needed, but with 48.6% of students in Level 1 for ELA and 51.6% of students in Level 1 for Mathematics, the focus on HCHS is to provide opportunities for students in the Level 1 buckets to show their growth and move closer to achieving a Level 3 score in both ELA and Mathematics.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors to the need for improvement in these areas include the COVID 19 pandemic and remote course opportunities for students. A great deal of instructional time in the 2020-2021 school year was spent on identifying which students were participating in which programs. Better identification, tracking, support, and most importantly, instruction of these students is imperative for the 2021-2022 school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The most improvement was found in Algebra 1 and US History EOCs. Showing an increase of 4 points in Algebra 1 and 3 points in US History is impressive considering the challenges the teachers and students faced throughout the year. Also, SWD was the best performing subgroup in mathematics learning gains with over 40% in both learning gains and learning gains among the bottom quartile.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to these improvements include building teacher-student relationships as well as continuous work with standards-based assessment and instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The biggest strategy that will be needed to implement learning is the re-implementation of both grade-alike and subject-alike PLCs. Creating opportunities for teachers to come together to work and discuss students and standards is greatly needed.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional learning opportunities include PLC facilitation, teacher-student relationship professional learning, as well as support for standards and curricular resources.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The greatest additional service needed for sustainability are consistent funds. Having appropriate and consistent funding to be able to provide support for teachers to put in the time needed to ensure success for their students is paramount to the success of HCHS.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the administrative shake up within the District, several positions have changed. Mr. Mitchell has moved from his position as a teacher colleague to Assistant Principal. His knowledge in curriculum and instruction should help tremendously. MJ Kinard has been added to the Middle School staff as a Dean, she has a Masters in educational Leadership and her added knowledge in Leadership is helping to build the relationships in the middle grades. Mr. Arie Slone has been added as a High School Dean, he jas a great relationship with our High School students and his ability to communicate with them will hopefully cut down on the number of referrals.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students being suspended has been earmarked and with the addition of two new individuals to the staff should decrease the number of referrals throughout the year.
Monitoring:	The number of referrals will be monitored monthly to see where we are as compared to previous years.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald Harrison (donald.harrison@hamiltonfl.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Review the discipline matrix, determine the responsibilities of who writes referrals and when. Parent contact is key. Positive contact to all parents before anything negative. Consistent enforcement of the school rules by all teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Gain trust of parents, reinforcement from them to assist in getting students on board. Teachers must be consistent with enforcement of policies.

Action Steps to Implement

Positive calls to parents.
Meetings with each student body class.
Consistent enforcement of school policies and rules.
Parent contact when rules are not followed.
Follow matrix with discipline.

Person Responsible	Donald Harrison (donald.harrison@hamiltonfl.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The economically disadvantaged subgroup is a subgroup that encompasses many of our students as well as students that qualify through other demographics such as race and ELL. For the ELA assessment, 56.2% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored level 1 with 23.1% scoring level 2, for a total of 79.3% performing below level 3. In Mathematics, 55.4% of these students were level 1 and 23.5% were level 2, for a total of 78.9% scoring below level 3.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal for the 2021-2022 school year is to decrease the number of Economically Disadvantaged students performing below level 3 in ELA and mathematics to 60%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through our quarterly progress monitoring as well as ensuring that students who meet the criteria for this subgroup are appropriately identified for teachers to monitor in their classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Mitchell (ryan.mitchell@hamiltonfl.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2020-2021 school year, 72.4% of all students performed at levels 1 and 2 on the ELA assessment (27.6% were level 3+). Additionally, 71.3% of students scored below level 3 on the science assessments (28.7% were level 3+) and 58.2% (41.8% were level 3+) performed below level 3 on the social studies exams. Improving our ELA scores will also help increase science and social studies scores.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2021-2022 school year, HCHS will increase the percentage of students performing above level 3 on the ELA assessment from 27.6% to 35%. Students passing the science exams will increase from 28.7% to 36% and students passing the social studies exams will increase from 41.8% to 49%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through our quarterly progress monitoring, classroom walkthroughs and observations, and monthly PLC meetings with teachers to review data and progress on standards-based instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Louis Daniels (louis.daniels@hamiltonfl.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2020-2021 school year, 73.4% of all students performed at levels 1 and 2 on the mathematics assessments (26.6% were level 3+).
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2021-2022 school year, HCHS will increase the percentage of students performing above level 3 on the mathematics assessments from 26.6% to 35%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through our quarterly progress monitoring, classroom walkthroughs and observations, and monthly PLC meetings with teachers to review data and progress on standards-based instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Mitchell (ryan.mitchell@hamiltonfl.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When compared to other schools in the state, Hamilton County ranks as Very High. As a result, Hamilton County School District added a second Dean of students. One will be for grades 7-8 and one for 9-12. We have also instituted a SAVE Club to help with promoting kindness on the campus. Students are afforded the opportunity to work off time in lieu of ISS or OSS for several incidents. Each morning, words of wisdom are included to help promote a positive image and suggestions on how to be helpful and kind to each other.

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.

The school has adopted the slogan of Raising the Bar this year. As a school , t-shirts were made for all staff with a graph and the slogan on it. In all things we address related to school grade and culture we are trying to raise the Bar. Our goal is to be the Number 1 school in North Florida.
We also have a SAVE club which stresses being positive and kind to all.
The morning announcements end each day with a few words of wisdom, which encourages students to be positive, find ways to be kind to others and to think about what they are doing before they do it.
Students of the Month-Each month each grade level submits names of worthy students to be voted on to receive the award. They are given gifts and pictures are posted and they are recognized for their efforts.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers and Staff-help to promote the positive culture.
District Staff-Help to promote a positive culture with support from the District.
Area Businesses-Provide incentive materials to help students stay focused.
Parents/Volunteers-They are asked to be involved in the children and provide support to the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development				$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged				$34,770.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0032 - Hamilton County High School	Title, I Part A		$18,450.00
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0032 - Hamilton County High School	Title, I Part A		$16,320.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00

	Total:	$34,770.00