Hill Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hill Middle School

5200 EHRLICH RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ronald Mason

Start Date for this Principal: 4/20/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Hill Middle School

5200 EHRLICH RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	58%

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Use respect, responsibility and relationships to foster student achievement.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mason, Ronald	Principal	Instructional Leadership, Community Liaison, Cost Center & Budget Reporting, Staff Supervisor, Hiring Supervisor
Stover, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Facility Supervisor, Maintenance & Building Request & Reporting, Bus Ramp Supervisor, Discipline Supervisor

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 4/20/2014, Ronald Mason

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
72

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,029

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
1

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	217	211	212	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	64	71	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	9	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	7	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	57	52	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	81	60	0	0	0	0	197
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	4	32	22	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	27	31	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 6/20/2021

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	217	211	212	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	64	71	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	9	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	7	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	57	52	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	81	60	0	0	0	0	197

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	32	22	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	27	31	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	217	211	212	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	64	71	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	9	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	7	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	57	52	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	81	60	0	0	0	0	197

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	32	22	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	27	31	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				59%	51%	54%	56%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	52%	54%	57%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	47%	47%	52%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				65%	55%	58%	64%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				67%	57%	57%	66%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	51%	57%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				53%	47%	51%	50%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	67%	72%	75%	66%	72%

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	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison	-56%					
08	2021					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison	-56%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	63%	62%	1%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	41%	31%	10%	46%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	51%	47%	4%	48%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	78%	67%	11%	71%	7%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Baseline Assessment, Mid-Year Assessment, Mid-Year Exams

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	56	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	59	22
	Students With Disabilities	41	46	42
	English Language Learners	31	48	39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33	56	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	14	18
	Students With Disabilities	18	13	15
	English Language Learners	17	2	5

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	59	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	59	55
	Students With Disabilities	42	46	53
	English Language Learners	35	42	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34	56	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	6	9
	Students With Disabilities	27	6	8
	English Language Learners	23	1	3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	34	50	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	47	49
	Students With Disabilities	31	43	45
	English Language Learners	25	35	38

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57	68	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	67	52
	Students With Disabilities	51	63	44
	English Language Learners	30	44	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	43	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	8	6
	Students With Disabilities	25	33	48
	English Language Learners	15	5	8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	45	49	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	54	65
	Students With Disabilities	46	40	54
	English Language Learners	36	27	29

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	14	23	19	20	31	28	21	25			
ELL	32	47	45	36	41	31	24	43	88		
ASN	59	72		72	55		62	75	88		
BLK	35	34	31	42	61	41	22	48			
HSP	45	42	31	51	46	35	39	58	85		
MUL	51	34	33	49	36	33	44	75	82		
WHT	57	52	51	67	57	47	52	78	83		
FRL	43	43	36	48	46	33	39	57	80		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	40	38	21	53	54	11	55			
ELL	25	51	55	38	55	48	31	60	79		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	77	66		84	80		71	95	93		
BLK	42	53	48	48	66	69	36	84	95		
HSP	52	58	53	59	65	52	44	72	90		
MUL	70	58		77	64	64	75	85	100		
WHT	69	65	58	74	69	66	67	91	95		
FRL	52	57	49	58	65	55	48	77	90		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	41	44	22	47	44	19	35	67		
ELL	28	54	52	35	58	56	24	45	82		
ASN	80	58		85	70		100	81	100		
BLK	47	58	70	55	69	64	35	67	82		
HSP	50	55	47	59	63	54	44	67	95		
MUL	63	65		73	62						
WHT	62	59	57	68	69	69	57	85	93		
FRL	49	54	48	59	65	57	42	69	92		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
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	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	60
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Based on the ESSA Data, the federal index for students with disabilities (SWD) is 36%. The other subgroups in the school have a federal index between 52%-81%. SWD are significantly less, which indicates the need for extra support for this subgroup. Our subgroup federal index for SWD has been within a percentage point the last two
school years. Factors that may have contributed are varying instructional materials and differentiation of instruction.

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

As mentioned above, our students with disabilities (SW3) demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

As our federal index for SWD is 36% and our federal index for all students is 66%. One new action that would need to take place is a focus on literacy in all content areas. When students' literacy skills improve, their success in various academic areas can improve as well.

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

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

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

For the past several school years, Ben Hill has focused on literacy for both the ESE population and the general education population. Programs such as Bright Fish were introduced in the 2017-2018 school year.

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

We will have our Summer Extravaganza to discuss current data from the 2020-21 FSA tests and determine the best way to meet the needs of our students.

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.

Content area teachers will participate in trainings, so they can incorporate literacy effectively into their classroom. This will provide them with knowledge, resources, and support.

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

Support facilitators will pull small groups on a regular basis to incorporate literacy into various content areas, such as science and history.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus for school year is to improve learning gains for all students in Language Arts as indicated by the 2020-2021 FSA ELA. There will be an emphasis on increasing learning gains for lower quartile students.
Measurable Outcome:	We intend to increase learning gains for all students in Language Arts from a 59% to a 62%. According to the FLDOE report card, a 62% or higher constitutes as a school grade of an "A" in that content area. Additionally, the lower quartile students will increase learning gains in Language Arts from a 53% to a 57%, which would constitute as a school grade of a "B" for that subgroup. This is based on 2018-2019 data; this will be updated when we receive current school data.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored by analyzing FSA data, the Achieve 3000 Level Set assessments, writing baseline exams, and the Bright Fish program for our lower-quartile students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Teryl Lindsey (teryl.lindsey@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is creating interdisciplinary units in all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If literacy strategies are intertwined in content areas, this will allow for learning gains on both the reading and writing portion of the FSA ELA assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

"Summer Extravaganza" to begin data analysis, discuss what specifically needs to be done to reach our goal, and discuss important dates.

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

Interdisciplinary lessons/literacy trainings to provide teachers with the knowledge and resources they need to work on implementing this in their classroom.

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

SWD set as instructional priority with a goal to address needs of students. Common goal for whole school. Formal training w/ instructional leaders w/ ESE strategies and methods to improve performance. Whole-school training led by instructional leaders. Data-tracking system to identify areas of focus. PLC's to focus on analyzed data and address needs through instructional collaboration.

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

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.

Hill Middle School ranks 21/46 for violent incidents, 19/46 for property incidents, and 31/46 for drug/public order incidents. The number 46 represents the number of schools in the county. Based on this information, Hill will continue their incentive program that they started at the end of the school year last year, which is pawsitive praise. Students will be recognized for taking the extra mile and be placed into a raffle weekly. Starting with 6th grade students, students will be exposed to a SEL curriculum during homeroom once a week, which will assist in mitigating some of these incidents.

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.

Hill Middle School's SAC aims to involve various stakeholders to assist in meeting students' needs and helping students' academically succeed. Typically, the meetings consist of administration, teachers, guidance counselors, and parents. Additionally, there are several events that we encourage parents to attend, such as open house, conference nights, chorus/band/orchestra concerts, and AVID events.

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

Administration and teachers will utilize Bi-Monthly Data Analysis to identify standards of focus and develop action plans. Guidance counselors, parents, and SAC Committee members will discuss the negative impacts of social media on education and strategies & policies to mitigate those impacts.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00