

Hardee County Schools

Hardee Junior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Hardee Junior High School

2401 US HIGHWAY 17 N, Wauchula, FL 33873

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/junior_high

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hardee County School Board on 10/26/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mosley, Sheryl	Principal	
White, Tracey	Assistant Principal	
Jaquez, Elizabeth	School Counselor	
DeAnda, Lisa	Other	
Kouns, Sherri	Reading Coach	
Shepard, Michelle	Math Coach	
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	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process used to develop the SIP at HJH includes utilizing the school's leadership team and the School Advisory Council. The leadership team includes representatives from the administration team, teachers, and support staff. The School Advisory Council includes a wide representation of community stakeholders that include; parents, community representatives, and teachers.

The SIP is developed by soliciting input from the leadership team members. This input is used to develop school-based goals. The SIP is shared at SAC meetings to gain feedback from the members. The SIP is then edited and modified throughout the school year as the needs for improvement change.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effectiveness through ongoing data chats with grade-level reading and math teachers. Quarterly data chats will include the use of mini-assessment and benchmark data to determine student progress and possible changes to the curriculum as needed. Results for PM1 and PM2 will also be utilized to determine the effectiveness of the SIP and whether learning goals need to be altered to meet the needs of the students. PM1 will take place in September while PM 2 will take place in December, giving teachers time to review their data prior to PM 3. Discussions around tier 2 and tier 3 students will also be visited at this time. Students with the greatest achievement gap will also be tracked through Problem-Solving Team meetings, where discussions of a student's individual data will take place. The Rtl team will include a school counselor, a psychologist, a teacher, and a parent. Data will also be utilized to determine increased intervention for students with the greatest achievement gap. The I-Ready program will also be utilized to determine tier 2 and tier 3 students' progress toward academic standards and be beneficial in determining whether or not the SIP's goals align with the needs of the school, the low-performing student population, and individual student needs.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C

	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	42	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	110	169
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	102	139
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	57	124
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	112	132	334
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	76	118	273
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	51	100

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	41	41	50	45	45	54
ELA Learning Gains	41	41	48	47	47	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35	35	38	44	44	47
Math Achievement*	48	48	54	56	56	58
Math Learning Gains	52	52	58	55	55	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50	50	55	44	44	51
Science Achievement*	37	37	49	37	37	51
Social Studies Achievement*	61	61	71	61	61	72
Middle School Acceleration	56			57		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	50			50		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	37	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	45			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	42			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	41	41	35	48	52	50	37	61	56			50

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
SWD	23	36	23	33	49	41	15	40	50			
ELL	23	29	31	38	46	61	11	45	36			50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	43	47	32	52	52	40	46				
HSP	38	41	35	45	51	49	31	57	50			53
MUL	47	35		53	71							
PAC												
WHT	50	42	31	56	55	51	49	69	66			
FRL	36	39	33	40	47	47	32	53	48			40

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	43	37	26	43	34	33	40	57	64			50
SWD	22	25	18	28	35	26	21	31	77			
ELL	32	32	24	36	33	33	30	52	63			50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	24	19	30	33	42	9	58				
HSP	39	36	28	39	32	34	33	53	62			55
MUL	61	50		67	39							
PAC												
WHT	54	43	21	54	38	24	57	66	70			
FRL	37	33	24	36	31	31	33	51	54			50

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	45	47	44	56	55	44	37	61	57			50
SWD	22	38	33	25	45	47	15	36				
ELL	24	41	46	36	33	30	20	44				50
AMI												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
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			45
MUL	32	33		47	61							
PAC												
WHT	60	58	49	69	65	44	60	72	63			
FRL	38	44	43	49	52	43	29	58	51			57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	36%	36%	0%	47%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	39%	1%	47%	-7%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	42%	0%	47%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	43%	1%	48%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	35%	1%	44%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	39%	46%	50%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	66%	-22%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on the 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring 3 assessment, 7th grade ELA showed the lowest performance. Compared to the state, 7th grade ELA was 11% below the state average with a 35% achievement in level 3s or higher. 8th grade ELA had the second lowest performance with only 39% of students scoring a level 3 or higher and was 8% below the state average. 6th grade ELA had 42% level 3s or higher and was only 5% below the state average. English Language Arts had the lowest performance when compared to the state average.

Contributing factors to last year's performance include sporadic student attendance, lack of instructional rigor in the new state standards, and lack of accountability for all stakeholders. Due to the change in standards trends are difficult to determine at this time as FSA and FAST scores are not comparable.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest deficit when compared to the state average is 7th Grade ELA. 7th grade was 11% below the state average. Last year's scores and not comparable to the previous year's scores (2022 FSA).

The contributing factors to last year's performance include sporadic student attendance, an overall lack of instructional rigor in the new state standards, and a lack of accountability for all stakeholders. Additional factors include a lack of use of proven instructional programs and strategies such as I-Ready and Response to Intervention.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

When compared to the state average, 8th-grade science had the greatest gap with a 12% difference. 35% of students had a level 3 or higher on the 2022 and 2023 Science EOC.

The contributing factors to last year's performance include a lack of change in instructional strategies, an overall lack of instructional rigor, and a lack of accountability for all stakeholders. Additional factors include a lack of progress monitoring using mini-assessments and benchmarks.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Due to the change in standards, improvement is difficult to determine at this time as FSA and FAST scores are not comparable. However, the subjects performing at or above the state average are Algebra 1 at 85% level 3s or higher. Algebra 1 was 1% below the state average of 86%. Contributing factors include after-school tutoring and summer school remediation for students needing to retake the Algebra 1 EOC.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on the 2022 EWS data, SWD and ELL students continue to perform below 41% with SWD scoring 34% and ELL scoring a 37% on the federal percent of points index of 2022. 2023 marks the third year that the subgroups are below 41%.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Development of a fluid B.E.S.T. standards-based curriculum pacing guide for each subject and grade level.
2. Targeted support of SWDs and ELL students that includes rigorous grade-level instruction.
3. Progress monitoring of student achievement through the use of mini-assessments, benchmarks, PST meetings, and progress monitoring assessments. For tier 2 and tier 3 students, Read 180, the I-Ready diagnostic, and individual student learning paths will be used to monitor individual student progress.
4. Ongoing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that are centered around real-time data and result in curriculum alignments and adjustments.
5. Development of action steps by grade teams that will result in a direct impact on student achievement.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the 2022 (2023 F.A.S.T. data not yet available) statewide assessment 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 made 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. Based on the 2023 FAST, the area with the greatest deficit when compared to the state is 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 2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Professional Learning Communities focused on standards-based instruction.
Curriculum planning and alignment to the B.E.S.T. standards.
Continuous monitoring of student growth and achievement via multiple data sources.
Benchmarks and mini-assessments that are planned and implemented for progress monitoring.
Use of PM1 and PM2 for progress monitoring data to determine low-performing areas for individual students and tier 1.
Data chats with academic coaches that result in action steps that improve the quality of instruction.
Targeted Response to Intervention Support (Rtl) and monitoring of student progress in Problem-Solving Team Meetings.
I-Ready diagnostic assessments that result in individual student-targeted learning paths for progress monitoring.
Implementation of ESE strategies and support services that are aligned to grade-level standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 tier 3 students.
3. Implementation of Read 180 and System 44 for tier 3 students in the area of reading.
4. Use of the I-Ready program with fidelity that includes the diagnostic and targeted student learning paths for progress monitoring.
5. Plan for research-based instructional resources for both ELA and Math tier 2 and 3 students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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 tier 3 instruction outside of tier 1 allowing for targeted support.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 using I-Ready for tier 2 students.
4. Plan for Response to Intervention targeted instruction using I-Ready for tier 3 students.
5. Plan for after-school instruction and support for targeted SWDs.
6. Utilize daily phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension support for tier 3 students in Read 180 and System 44.

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

By When:

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on 2022 statewide assessments in ELA (2023 F.A.S.T. assessment no yet available), 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 and mini-assessments 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, and continued progress monitoring

Implementation of ELL strategies and support services that are research-based.

Daily use of Rosetta Stone for targeted students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 tier 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 professionals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 of I-Ready diagnostic for progress monitoring and additional intervention support for tier 2 and tier 3 ELL students.
4. Provide additional instruction in after school programs.
5. Plan for the support of ELL students through the use of site based ELL and migrant paraprofessionals.
6. Daily phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension support through the use of Read 180 and System 44 for tier ELL students.

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

By When:

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To promote a positive culture and environment, a school-wide program titled "Capturing Kid's Hearts" will be continued for the 2023-2024 school year. Based on school-wide discipline reports and teacher feedback it was determined that teachers required additional training in positive behavior support practices for classroom-managed behaviors that will result in uninterrupted classroom instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There will be a 50% decrease in office referrals for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The use of Capturing Kid's Hearts will be monitored quarterly through the number of referrals submitted by teacher, per student, etc.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through the use of Capturing Kid's Hearts teachers and students will jointly set standards for behavior by creating a social contract. Teachers will then utilize the contract to deliver clear expectations and feedback for behavior. Capturing Kid's Hearts will serve as a behavior intervention tool that will set clear expectations for teachers and students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is that it provides teachers with tools to help maintain a positive classroom environment, is easy to use, and develops positive teacher students relationships creating a school-wide culture that promotes a safe learning environment for all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Teachers will introduce students to CKH.
2. Teachers and students will develop a social contract.
3. Social contracts will be displayed in the classroom.
4. Teachers will utilize CKH strategies when needed.
5. Teachers and students will share feedback on the CKH program.
6. Administration and administrative support staff will utilize CKH for office-managed behaviors.

7. Administration and support staff will provide additional resources and support to teachers to assist in implementing CKH school-wide.

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

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School improvement funding allocations are reviewed by district staff, administrators, the leadership team, and the SAC committee. Focusing on the 3 goals in the School Improvement Plan, grade group teams meet for weekly PLC's to discuss data obtained from weekly assessments and quarterly benchmarks. This data helps to determine how funds should be allocated to best meet the needs of our students.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be disseminated to teachers and staff during leadership team meetings. The plan will be discussed throughout the school year during grade-level data chats. It will also be shared with the School Advisory Council during its first meeting and discussed throughout the school year. The SIP will be available to the public on the school website located at <https://hjh.hardee.k12.fl.us/>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

To promote a positive culture and behavior, a school-wide program titled "Capturing Kids Hearts will be continued in the 2023-2024 school year. In addition to teachers and students, 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. In addition to these activities parents can also gain a better of understanding of their child's education through PST, 504, and IEP meetings. These events and systems are utilized to bring families, students, and educators together to establish positive circumstances, build

relationships, and further develop parent/student knowledge of school-wide expectations and educational practices.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

To strengthen the academic program at HJH, some students have been scheduled into remediation courses based on grades and PM3 results. These programs include Tier 2 and Tier 3 I-Ready and the Read 180 program. To increase the quality of enriched and accelerated curriculum programs new courses have been added this year that include robotics, STEM, and a 7th-grade technology class. The following courses will also provide students with high school credit this school year: 7th grade Ag, 8th Culinary, and robotics. These courses are in addition to the courses that were already part of the HJH curriculum and give students high school credit. These courses include 8th-grade agriculture, 7th & 8th-grade technology, and Algebra 1.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The plan is developed in coordination with Career and Technical programs to improve the academic programs at HJH including; Culinary, computers, robotics, and agriculture. This plan was also developed in collaboration with Tri-County drug prevention programs such as SWAT and STAND. School counselors also provide after-school counseling for students in addition to daily services. School counselors also provide mental health lessons to support students. A life skills course was added this year to support the inclusion of a life skills goal in IEPs. Collaboration also extends to the two social workers on site that assist families with housing and misc. family needs.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school collaborates with in-house and outside services to provide specialized services that are not academically related. HJH has added a life skills class this school year to support students with disabilities. Life skills are also taught in physical education courses to 6th-grade students. School counselors offer counseling services throughout the school day and after school to all students. School counselors also plan for mental health lessons for all students. Mental health services are provided through school-based counselors and on-site social workers. Social workers also provide assistance with housing and family needs. The school collaborates with Tri-County services to support student drug prevention programs such as STAND and SWAT.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Several Career and Technical courses are offered at Hardee Junior High. These include courses related to the fields of Culinary, Agriculture, and Technology. Through these programs, students may earn certifications such as Food Safety, Microsoft, Word Press, and Agriculture Foundations. The courses

offered at HJH prepare students for more advanced Career and Technical programs at the high school level.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The RTI model is used to provide early intervention for problem behavior. School counselors, parents, teachers, administrators, and the school psychologist meet to brainstorm strategies that will aid students with problem behaviors. These strategies may include developing a Behavior Improvement Plan or Point Card System. Students that return to HJH from alternative placement at Pioneer Academy enter into a School Contract which outlines expected levels of attendance, academic performance, and behavior.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

When the district-wide school calendar is developed, in-service days for teacher and paraprofessional training are scheduled. These in-service days are used to provide teacher training for growth and development that directly impact student achievement. When planning these trainings HJH utilizes a variety of personnel to deliver training in specialized programs. These trainers and expertise include Academic Coaches, teachers, counselors, and district personnel. These trainings include; AVID, I-Ready, FOCUS, ESE, and ELL strategies. The selection of these trainings is based on the individual teacher and grade level team needs.

Data chats are held throughout the school year with math and reading teachers. These data chats are used to analyze progress monitoring data, benchmarks, and mini-assessments. Changes are then made to the curriculum map as needed to further drive student advancement and achievement.

In an effort to retain and recruit highly qualified teachers, Academic Coaches serve as support for new teachers. Academic coaches provide a variety of services such as mentoring, modeling lessons, and behavior support. Beginning teachers also receive training through an online beginning teacher course. Each grade team also meets in Professional Learning Communities each week to collaborate on instruction and student performance. Adjustments to the curriculum are made during these meetings to further support student achievement.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No