

Hardee County Schools

# Hardee Junior High School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Hardee Junior High School

2401 US HIGHWAY 17 N, Wauchula, FL 33873

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/junior\_high

## Demographics

Principal: Sheryl Mosley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hardee 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Hardee Junior High School

2401 US HIGHWAY 17 N, Wauchula, FL 33873

[www.hardee.k12.fl.us/junior\\_high](http://www.hardee.k12.fl.us/junior_high)

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	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	71%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hardee 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.

Hardee Junior High will provide appropriate and meaningful educational opportunities for our students, so that all may reach their maximum potential, thereby enabling them to become productive and competitive citizens in a global society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

"Empower and inspire all students for success."

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mosley, Sheryl	Principal	
Tubbs, Travis	Assistant Principal	
White, Tracey	Assistant Principal	
Jaquez, Elizabeth	School Counselor	
DeAnda, Lisa	Instructional Coach	
Kouns, Sherri	Reading Coach	
Shepard, Michelle	Math Coach	
Calvillo, Linda	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Neal, Monica	Teacher, K-12	
Ford, Micaela	Teacher, K-12	
Kirkland, Missy	Teacher, K-12	
Newman, Sheena	Teacher, K-12	
Gough, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Laughlin, Jacob	Teacher, K-12	
Wandrey, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
McGuckin, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Lane, Heather	Teacher, ESE	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/10/2022, Sheryl Mosley

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

68

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,158

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

12

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

12

### Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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



Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/20/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA		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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data 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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	41%	50%				45%	45%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						47%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						44%	44%	47%
Math Achievement	48%	34%	36%				56%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	52%						55%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						44%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	48%	53%				37%	37%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	52%	58%				61%	61%	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	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	38%	38%	0%	52%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	48%	1%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	59%	59%	0%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2022					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	46%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	37%	36%	1%	48%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	60%	59%	1%	71%	-11%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	53%	46%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

### Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	23	36	23	33	49	41	15	40	50		
ELL	23	29	31	38	46	61	11	45	36		
BLK	32	43	47	32	52	52	40	46			
HSP	38	41	35	45	51	49	31	57	50		
MUL	47	35		53	71						
WHT	50	42	31	56	55	51	49	69	66		
FRL	36	39	33	40	47	47	32	53	48		
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	22	25	18	28	35	26	21	31	77		
ELL	32	32	24	36	33	33	30	52	63		
BLK	31	24	19	30	33	42	9	58			
HSP	39	36	28	39	32	34	33	53	62		
MUL	61	50		67	39						
WHT	54	43	21	54	38	24	57	66	70		
FRL	37	33	24	36	31	31	33	51	54		

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	22	38	33	25	45	47	15	36			
ELL	24	41	46	36	33	30	20	44			
ASN	30	40		60	50						
BLK	30	41	39	46	58	52	26	67	42		
HSP	42	44	44	52	51	42	31	57	55		
MUL	32	33		47	61						
WHT	60	58	49	69	65	44	60	72	63		
FRL	38	44	43	49	52	43	29	58	51		

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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 data from the 2022 school year, ELA test results indicate a 2% drop in level 3s and higher and math showed an increase of 5%. When compared to the state, ELA was 10% below the state average and math was 7% below the state average in level 3s and higher. When analyzing grade level data, 6th grade ELA was 10% below the state average, 7th grade was 6% below the state average, and 8th grade was 14% below the state average. In math, 6th grade was 5% below the state average and 8th grade was 6% below the state average. 7th grade made was equivalent to the state with 46%. The subgroup data for the 2022 school year indicates an increase in ELA learning gains for SWDs but a decrease of 3% in ELL students. Math subgroup data for learning gains indicates a 14% increase in SWDs and a 13% increase for ELL students.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

The data components in the subgroup area for SWDs and ELL indicate a great need for improvement in the subject area of ELA and Math. These two subgroups continue to perform below their peers although the data indicate progress for ELLs in math. ELA achievement for SWDs showed a 1% increase while ELL students showed a decrease of 9%. Math achievement for SWDs showed a small improvement of 5% and ELL students improved by only 2%. Within these two subgroups, the bottom quartile in ELA showed a 5% increase for SWDs and a 7% increase for ELL students. The bottom quartile of SWD students in math showed a 15% increase while the ELL students showed a large increase of 28%.

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

The contributing factors to last year's performance include sporadic student attendance an overall lack of instructional rigor, and a lack of accountability for all stakeholders. To address this need for improvement a return to documented weekly PLC meetings, data chats, and progress monitoring testing (F.A.S.T.) will occur. In addition, to these actions, the new state-implemented attendance policies will be implemented with fidelity.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The data component that showed the most improvement is in the subgroup ELL math learning gains for the lowest 25%. The ELL subgroup showed a 28% increase from 33% to 61%.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement included:

- Progress monitoring- I-Ready, mini-assessments, and Tier 3 instruction
- Curriculum planning and alignment
- Data chats centered around mini-assessments
- Beginning teacher support
- After-school instruction

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

The following strategies will need to be implemented to maintain and improve student learning:

- Development of B.E.S.T. standards-based curriculum pacing guides.
- Implementation of the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessments.
- Data Chats focused on the F.A.S.T. PM assessment data.
- Ongoing Professional Learning Community (PLCs) meeting and curriculum alignment/adjustments
- I-Ready progress monitoring of tier 2 and 3 students in ELA and tier 3 students in math.
- Targeted support of SWDs and ELL students: ESE and ELL paras
- 

**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.**

To address student performance in the subgroups of SWDs and ELL students in ELA and math, HJH will implement the following initiatives:

1. Curriculum & Best Practices professional development with Academic Coaches
2. Professional development focused on ELL and ESE instructional strategies
3. Development of fluid curriculum pacing guides aligned to new standards and adjusted for progress monitoring data.
4. Designated common planning time for grade-level PLCs.
5. Standards-based benchmarks for monitoring student growth and achievement 3 times per year.
6. Mini-assessments and cold reads based on standards that have been taught.
7. Monthly data chats with Academic Coach
8. Use of research-based programs and support materials in intensive classes.
9. Horizontal alignment across grade levels.
10. Professional development for interpreting and understanding progress monitoring assessments.

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

An ongoing increase in all teachers' knowledge and understanding of the new standards and progress monitoring assessments is necessary to ensure sustainability. Development of fluid standards-based pacing guides centered on PM data. PM data will be utilized to make adjustments to instruction and pacing guides during PLC and data chats with Academic Coaches. Teachers will use progress monitoring assessments in conjunction with standards-based benchmarks to monitor student growth and achievement. In addition to benchmarks, intensive teachers will utilize I-Ready to monitor and target tier 2 and tier 2 students' instructional paths. Ongoing horizontal alignment of instruction will allow for continuous growth and improvement across grade levels.

### **Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 2022 statewide assessments in ELA and math, students in our SWD subgroup scored significantly below their peers in ELA achievement overall. Students in the SWD subgroups made a 1% improvement in 2022 and a 5% improvement in the lowest quartile. SWDs make an 11% improvement in learning gains. In math, the SWD subgroup increased their overall achievement by 5% and the lowest quartile increased by 15%. However, students in the subgroup SWD continue to perform well below their peers in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

50% of the SWD subgroup will make learning gains on the ELA portion of the F.A.S.T. assessment for the 2023 school year.

**Monitoring:**  
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Professional Learning Community focused on standards-based instruction.  
 Curriculum Planning and Alignment  
 Continuous monitoring of student growth and achievement via multiple data sources  
 Benchmarks for progress monitoring  
 Data chats with academic coaches  
 Targeted response to Intervention Support (Rtl) and monitoring of student progress in Problem Solving Team Meetings  
 I-Ready diagnostic and student targeted learning paths progress monitoring  
 Implementation of ESE strategies and support services

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Provide training for all instructional staff in the areas of SWDs while providing research-based instructional materials and teaching strategies.
2. Plan for Rtl instruction time outside of Tier 1 instruction for tier 2 and 3 students.
3. Implementation of Read 180 and System 44 for Tier 3 students in the area of reading.
4. Plan for math tier 3 instruction outside of the Tier 1 math instruction.
5. Plan for research-based instructional resources for both ELA and Math tier 2 and 3 students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.  
 Describe the

By providing additional targeted support through research-based resources, instructional programs, and staff training, student learning gains for SWD in ELA and math will improve. These resources and programs include I-Ready, Read 180, and System 44. In addition to programs, students will receive additional support through tier 2 and 3 instruction outside of tier 1 allowing for targeted support.

**resources/criteria  
used for selecting  
this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional development for all staff members in ESE instructional strategies.
2. Utilize the I-Ready diagnostic for progress monitoring and individualized interventions.
3. Plan for Response to Intervention targeted instruction- 40 additional minutes for Tier 2 and Tier 3 ELA students.
4. Plan for Response to intervention targeted instruction- 40 additional minutes for Tier 3 math students.
5. Plan for after-school instruction and support for targeted SWDs
6. Utilize daily phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension support for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in Read 180 and System 44.

**Person  
Responsible** Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on 2022 statewide assessments in ELA, students in the subgroup ELL scored significantly below their peers. Students in the ELL subgroup dropped 9% in overall ELA achievement and 3% in ELA learning gains. The lowest quartile of ELL students did show a 7% increase in ELA for 2022. The ELL subgroup continues to perform well below their peers in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

50% of ELL students will make learning gains on the ELA portion of the F.A.S.T. assessment for the 2023 school year.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Professional Learning Community focused on standards-based instruction.  
Curriculum Planning and Alignment  
Continuous monitoring of student growth and achievement via multiple data sources  
Benchmarks for progress monitoring  
Data chats with academic coaches  
Targeted response to Intervention Support (Rtl) and monitoring of student progress in Problem Solving Team Meetings  
I-Ready diagnostic and student-targeted learning paths, progress monitoring  
Implementation of ELL strategies and support services

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

1. Provide training for all instructional staff in the areas of ELL while providing research-based instructional materials and teaching strategies.
2. Plan for Rtl instruction time outside of Tier 1 instruction for tier 2 and 3 ELL students.
3. Use of Rosetta Stone for English language acquisition.
4. Plan for research-based instructional resources for math tier 3.
5. Plan for maximum support through the use of ELL and migrant paraprofessionals.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

By providing staff professional development, additional targeted support through Rtl, and research-based instructional resources, ELL student learning gains in ELA will improve.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional development for all staff members in ELL classroom strategies and resources.
2. Plan for Rosetta Stone for English language acquisition daily.
3. Use I-Ready diagnostic for progress monitoring and additional intervention support for tier 2 and tier 3

ELL students.

4. Provide additional 40 minutes of RtI targeted instruction in tier 2 and tier 2.
5. Plan for additional instruction in after school
6. Plan for the support of ELL students through the use of site based ELL and migrant paraprofessionals.
7. Daily phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension support through the use of Read 180 and System 44 for Tier 3 ELL students.

**Person Responsible** Sheryl Mosley (smosley@hardee.k12.fl.us)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

### Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

NA

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

NA

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

**Action Step****Person Responsible for Monitoring**

NA

**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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

To promote a positive culture and behavior, a school-wide program titled "Capturing Kid's Hearts" will be implemented for the 2022-2023 school year. All staff received training during the summer of 2022. Teachers were given multiple instructional strategies to engage and keep students highly motivated. Teachers were also given specific dialog and techniques when encountering discipline issues in their classrooms. The administrative team at HJH also participated in leadership training and teacher training this summer. The use of this program will likely reduce the number of office-managed discipline issues. In addition to this program outside stakeholders such as parents are encouraged to play an active role in their child's education through the use of ongoing progress monitoring fast time reporting, attendance information via the school's robo-call system, and parent information nights at HJH. These events and systems are utilized to bring families, students, and educators together to establish positive communications, build relationships, and further develop parent/student knowledge of then school-wide expectations and educational practices.

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

**Students-** Students will participate in building school culture and learning environment by being on time and prepared for school each day. Students will follow school rules and expectations for learning. In addition to the curriculum, students can further their knowledge and skills by becoming active in school-sponsored clubs, organizations, and sports which provide opportunities for community service projects.

**Faculty-** Faculty remembers will aid in creating a positive school culture and learning environment by being in attendance, being prepared, collaborating with other staff members, and participating in professional development activities to increase their knowledge. Furthermore, faculty and staff will act as role models

and mentors for students by demonstrating good character traits and providing a safe learning environment for all students. Faculty can further develop relationships by maintaining open lines of communication with parents.

Parents- Parents can further improve the quality of the school culture and learning environment for their students by providing a positive and interactive home and school connection. Parents should also ensure that their student is prepared for school each day. Additionally, parents can stay up to date with school policies and expectations by staying in contact with their child's teachers and following school media sources such as Facebook, Instagram, local newspaper, and the school website.

Business Partners- Community business partners can further develop support for their local by supporting school projects and events.