

Nassau County School District

Hilliard Middle Senior High



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Hilliard Middle Senior High

1 FLASHES AVE, Hilliard, FL 32046

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: John Crawford

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (63%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Hilliard Middle Senior High

1 FLASHES AVE, Hilliard, FL 32046

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	53%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Hilliard Middle-Senior High School will educate, empower, and enable all students to become caring, contributing citizens who can succeed in an ever-changing world. HMSHS is committed to focusing on high expectations and individual academic success to create a community of respect and responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspire a passion for learning, excellence, and character.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Smith, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	
Crawford, John	Principal	Oversees all functions of the school
Moore, Amanda	Teacher, Adult	Reading Coach
Jarrett, Angela	School Counselor	Guidance 9-12
Milligan, Lawrence	Dean	
Vanzant, Jobeth	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/20/2022, John Crawford

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

760

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

8

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

10

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	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	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	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	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	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/5/2022

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	115	120	126	109	119	95	108	792
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	26	19	28	34	32	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	2	5	0	4	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	11	4	13	7	3	54
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	8	16	7	5	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	17	14	18	13	11	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	12	4	8	6	6	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	5	18	5	5	56

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	7	12	19	10	21	15	14	98

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	2	1	4	16

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	115	120	126	109	119	95	108	792
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	26	19	28	34	32	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	2	5	0	4	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	11	4	13	7	3	54
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	8	16	7	5	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	17	14	18	13	11	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	12	4	8	6	6	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	5	18	5	5	56

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	7	12	19	10	21	15	14	98

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	2	1	4	16

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	61%	60%	51%				67%	65%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						58%	55%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						54%	38%	42%
Math Achievement	74%	43%	38%				81%	64%	51%
Math Learning Gains	59%						67%	54%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						66%	52%	45%
Science Achievement	55%	57%	40%				49%	84%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	42%	48%				81%	80%	73%

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	70%	63%	7%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	72%	59%	13%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
		-70%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	65%	-8%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	88%	71%	17%	55%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	86%	76%	10%	54%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
08	2022					
	2019	64%	62%	2%	46%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

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%	60%	-23%	48%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	84%	-26%	67%	-9%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	82%	72%	10%	71%	11%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	82%	-1%	70%	11%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	74%	13%	61%	26%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	57%	68%	-11%	57%	0%

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	22	13	41	38	24	31	62		89	44
BLK	50	30		63	60	60	25	86			
HSP	70										
MUL	61	52		63	61	50					
WHT	61	43	22	76	58	42	58	80	68	93	85
FRL	53	37	26	68	54	41	48	75	72	91	80

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	34	38	28	39	37	25	33	60		75	
BLK	55	55		63	47						
HSP	82	80									
MUL	44	33		50	25						
WHT	61	51	30	70	43	40	68	84	62	82	80
FRL	53	44	27	59	39	39	60	80	49	75	69

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	53	47	56	62	60	21	44		67	
BLK	54	63		71	58	64	14				
MUL	56	56		79	57						
WHT	68	58	53	82	68	67	51	82	65	91	71
FRL	59	58	53	74	60	63	38	76	63	84	62

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	693
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
---------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
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	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
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	62
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	59
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?

ELA proficiency remained stagnant at 61%, while ELA learning gains decreased from 51% to 44% and ELA learning gains among our lowest quartile continue on a downward trend, dropping from 30% to 27%. Math achievement increased from 69% to 74%, math learning gains increased from 42% to 59% and learning gains within our lowest quartile increased from 40% to 45%. Science achievement fell from 65% to 55%.

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

Reading learning gains among the lowest quartile has dropped by 50% since 2019, while science achievement took a step backward after improving in 2021. Both of these will be areas in greatest need of 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?

Teacher turnover likely contributed to the decline in ELA learning gains within the lowest quartile and science proficiency. In ELA, we must ensure that we train our intensive reading teachers on explicit reading skills instruction to ensure that they know how to differentiate and how to put scaffolds in place to bridge the gap between students' reading level and the on-grade level material they will confront during high stakes testing. In science, we must ensure that our teachers are frequently exposing students to the FSAA-style questions and have data collection systems such as exit tickets in place to monitor progress.

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

All areas of math - proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains among the lowest quartile - showed improvement.

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

Team solidarity and cooperative planning are likely the greatest contributing factors to this improvement.

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

Tutoring and boot camps accelerate and retain learning. Targeted, collaborative, standards-based planning is also a contributing factor to accelerated learning.

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.

Many professional development opportunities exist to support novice teachers. We currently host a mini professional development session every other week for new teachers aimed at teaching them student engagement techniques. Our administration, reading coach, district coach and department chairs offer significant coaching opportunities, including classroom lesson modeling, peer observation, and peer walkthroughs. Leaders receive coaching through instructional rounds and reflections.

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

Our K-8 director is overseeing a literacy coaches academy, which will provide a tool for our reading coach and administration to offer coaching on targeted areas based on observations. While math is not an area of concern at this time, our directors have scheduled numerous opportunities for our math teachers to participate in professional development with their district peers and representatives of Math Nation,. This will include two on-campus coaching days.

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.

ESSA Subgroup - Students with Disabilities decreased from 41% in 2021 to 39% in 2022. The 39% Federal Index for SWD's is below 41%. SWD ELA learning gains decreased by 16%. ELA lowest quartile learning gains decreased by 15%.

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

The measurable outcome for this Area of Focus is that ELA and Math learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains for SWD's will increase by 5-7%.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using progress monitoring data from STAR reading assessments given monthly to students in the lowest 25% and for all students at the beginning, middle, and end of year. In addition, this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using STAR math assessments for all students at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The FAST assessment will also be administered three times per year and used to monitor progress in both reading and math. Lastly, we will monitor evidence-based strategies in teacher lesson plans and during classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

The evidence-based strategies being implemented for the Area of Focus include the following:
 Provide and ensure ESE teachers have common planning with their general education teammates, allowing them to understand the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) method of planning. This will also permit ESE teachers to develop a better understanding of the BEST standards, how to use data points and formative and summative assessments to drive instruction, and share best teaching practices with their general education counterparts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the

The efficacy of these strategies are why they were chosen to address the Area of Focus. Also, these strategies can be implemented without any large scale changes to our instructional model or master schedule. All teachers must be knowledgeable about reading instruction and understand that low readers need a systemic reading approach to help them decode challenging text. The UDL will provide support to struggling

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

readers. As for math, teachers will spiral back to previously taught concepts to help build automaticity with skills. These strategies all include UDL and have a strong correlation in achievement for students with learning disabilities.

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. Refine the instructional model for reading and math to enhance differentiated instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities.
2. Provide ESE teachers with collaborative planning time to model and discuss evidence-based practices, co-plan standards-based lessons, and analyze data with the general education teacher(s) to which they are assigned.
3. Enlist ESE teachers in professional development to a) enhance their understanding of the new BEST standards; and b) teach them how to design lesson plans that focus on spiraling back and reinforcing standards being covered by the general education teacher.
4. Administer Literacy intervention programs such as LLI and Sonday to help bridge the gap between current reading level and on-grade reading level of students with disabilities.
5. Employ a math spiral math review as part of the daily routine in support of the general education teacher.
6. Progress monitor students with disabilities and make necessary adjustments based on varying needs.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Science achievement fell from 65% in 2021 to 55% in 2022, continuing a "rollercoaster" pattern experienced in recent years. Students must be adequately equipped to perform on state assessments using more intentional small-group instruction and cooperative learning strategies that are bolstered by hands-on learning experiences.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percentage of students scoring at level 3 or above on both the NGSSS Science Assessment and the Biology 1 EOC, resulting in an overall resurgence of science achievement back to at least 65%.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will provide science teachers with a set of instructional expectations to include differentiated instruction and cooperative learning. We will engage in instructional observations to observe these expectations and attend meetings to examine data and observe data-based planning strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

High engagement instruction is evident and compliments standards-based instruction aligned to the curriculum pacing guide. District progress monitoring assessments are implemented and analyzed for standards mastery and instructional decisions. Teachers participate in instructional rounds to view best instructional practices, receive explicit instructional coaching, and effectively implement recommendations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Aligning instruction directly with prescribed standards, high student engagement, and intentional assessments are best practices for improving achievement.

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. Coaching of instructional best practices that target cooperative learning/high engagement instruction, classroom environment, and standards-based, data-driven planning.
2. Collaborative planning within the science department, as well as providing opportunities to observe planning and instruction from high performing peers within the district.
3. Cross-curricular observation of instruction by high-performing peers in other departments on campus.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

ELA learning gains among the lowest quartile were at 27% in 2022, which was 17% behind the district average and 14% behind the state average. Learning gains among our lowest quartile have decreased by 50% since 2019, when HMSHS (54%) was above the district average by 16% and the state average by 12%. Struggling readers need small-group instruction that focuses on building skills at their reading level to bridge the gap to on-grade level reading comprehension.

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

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve.

Learning gains among students within the lowest quartile will increase to 40%

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

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

* Administration will monitor classrooms to ensure skills-based instruction is evident within intensive reading classrooms.
* Progress will be monitored using STAR and FAST (PM 1, 2, and 3). Instructional decisions will be based upon the data revealed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Smith (smithja13@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

* Common planning allows teachers to share areas of strength and challenges within the standards and to share best practices to address those challenges.
* Teachers engage in data chats with individual students to identify challenges within the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Standards-based instruction with high engagement and differentiation is scientifically proven to be best practice. To be effective, the instruction needs to be planned according to student needs revealed through data. Progress monitoring using the STAR and FAST assessments and data chats with fellow colleagues and students will present several opportunities to identify and address weakness before high stakes testing at the end of the school year.

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. Monitor for skills-based instruction in intensive reading classes.
2. Conduct instructional observations to allow peers to observe what skills-based, small group instruction

looks like.

3. Provide on-site professional development to enhance skills-based instruction.
4. Monitor planning to ensure instruction is designed according to data.
5. Set aside time during planning for teachers to compare data and share best practices.
6. Have teachers intentionally plan in time to have data chats with their students.

Person

Jacqueline Smith (smithja13@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Responsible

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.

- * Positive Behavior Support (PBIS) strategies to reinforce our school-wide expectations.
- * Leadership meetings
- * Faculty meetings
- * School Advisory Council
- * Student government
- *Community partnerships with local churches
- * Partnership with Town of Hilliard
- * Extracurricular booster clubs
- * Starting Point Mental Health

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

Principal - Responsible for overseeing all functions of the school, including culture and environment.

Assistant Principal - Leads the PBIS initiative.

Dean - Works with the assistant principal to coordinate PBIS.

Guidance - Responsible for coordinating events with community partners.

School resource officer - Provides security and develops positive relationships with students.

On-site social worker - Provides on-site mental health counseling and acts as Liaison between HMSHS and Starting Point.