Santa Rosa County School District

Holley Navarre Middle School



2019-20 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 | 16 |
| Title I De series series | |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |
| Duagot to Capport Coals | U U |

Holley Navarre Middle School

1976 WILLIAMS CREEK DR, Navarre, FL 32566

http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/hnm/

Demographics

Principal: Joann Destefano

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2019

| 2019-20 Status | Active |
|---|---|
| (per MSID File) | 7104.70 |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 41% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (65%) 2014-15: A (72%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| ESSA Status | N/A |
|--|----------------------------------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo | or more information, click here. |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Santa Rosa 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 | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Holley Navarre Middle School

1976 WILLIAMS CREEK DR, Navarre, FL 32566

http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/hnm/

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2018-19 Title I School | Disadvan | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Middle Sch 6-8 | nool | No | | 41% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 34% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
| Grade | Α | A | Α | А |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Santa Rosa 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.

Holley Navarre Middle School is committed to providing the skills necessary for our students to compete both academically and technologically in the 21st century global community. Our mission will be accomplished through the collaboration of parents, teachers, students and community members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Holley Navarre Middle School strives to create a positive atmosphere that encourages its students to work confidently towards reaching their potential by becoming critical thinkers and life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|------------------------|--|
| DeStefano, Joann | Principal | Supervises the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur at Holley Navarre Middle School. Develops, implements, and assesses the instructional programs at the assigned school and coordinates with District instructional staff in program planning. Interviews and selects qualified personnel to be recommended for employment. Establishes guidelines for proper student conduct and implement Santa Rosa County Code of Conduct along with disciplinary procedures and policies that ensure a safe and orderly environment. Directs the development of the master schedule and assigns teachers according to identified needs. Ensures all state testing is completed within specified time and that all guidelines for administering said tests are followed. Makes data driven decisions regarding curriculum implementation. Utilizes current educational trends in the planning and preparation of the school instructional program. |
| Della Ratta, Pete | Assistant Principal | Acts on the Principal's behalf in his/her absence. Assists to develop and implement the school's instructional program with assistance from District personnel and provides its articulation among school personnel as assigned by the Principal. Develops the master teaching schedule and assign teachers according to identified needs. Utilizes current educational trends in the planning and preparation of the school instructional program. Manages and administers the attendance policy and procedures. Interprets and enforces the District's Code for Student Conduct. Assists in design and implementation of all safety plans. |
| Riggs, Hayden | Dean | Collaborates with school leadership to develop and implement Santa Rosa County Student Code of Conduct. De-escalates heightened student behavior and emotions. Communicates with at-risk students. Effectively communicates with parents and offer assistance as necessary. Effectively collaborates with teachers, leaders, parents, students, and district personnel. Assists in maintaining a safe and orderly learning environment. |
| Lattanze, Maureen | School Counselor | Assists students in the selection of classes; makes sure all state requirements are met. Makes necessary changes to student schedules throughout the year as indicated/needed. Provides input in the development of curriculum and the master schedule. Provides small group developmental guidance activities to all students; provides personal/social, behavioral, and/or academic counseling to all students. Provides assistance to parents of all students. Counsels students who are experiencing attendance difficulties and Interprets test results to parents, students, and other school staff. Provides orientation for all incoming and new students; counsels students in developing peer relationships, decision-making skills, and conflict resolution. Coordinates the proper maintenance, transfer, and acquisition of students' records as required. Coordinates all state testing and maintains all testing materials. |
| Freeman, Shundra | School Counselor | Provides assistance in the screening, referral, identification, and placement of students with special needs. |

Name Title

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assesses students using the Multi-Tier Support System and provides assistance. Monitors the 504 Plan process, including involving parents and school personnel, creating plans, and maintaining compliance. Assists students in the selection of classes; makes sure all state requirements are met. Makes necessary changes to student schedules throughout the year as indicated/needed. Provides input in the development of curriculum and the master schedule. Provides small group developmental guidance activities to all students; provides personal/social, behavioral, and/or academic counseling to all students. Provides assistance to parents of all students. Coordinates and/or assists with award presentations and 8th grade transition to high school activities.

Coordinates the proper maintenance, transfer, and acquisition of students' records as required. Coordinates all state testing and maintains all testing materials.

Stokes, Other

Tyler

Behavior Coach

Collaborates with school leadership to develop and implement/maintain a school wide positive behavior supports system to address the needs of all students, using a tiered intervention model. Collaborates with teachers and administrators to identify students in need of behavior intervention and Tier III and IEP goals for behavior. Develops Functional Behavior Assessments and Individual Positive Behavior Interventions. Develops and delivers individualized and group professional learning experiences for teachers in best practices for classroom management, positive behavior support, and cultural competency. Maintains all Behavioral PMP's for MTSS to facilitate fidelity of intervention and document Discipline through designated system.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 338 | 358 | 346 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1042 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 49 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 23 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 28 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 65 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 34 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 24 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

59

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | |
| | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-----------|-------------|-------|
| | | |

Students with two or more indicators

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 42 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 32 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 90 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---------------------|----|-------|----|----|---|-------|---|---|----|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 12 | TOtal | | | | | | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| Sahaal Crada Company | | 2019 | | 2018 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | 68% | 63% | 54% | 66% | 63% | 52% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 64% | 60% | 54% | 60% | 60% | 54% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | 56% | 47% | 50% | 52% | 44% | |
| Math Achievement | 73% | 70% | 58% | 71% | 71% | 56% | |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | 65% | 57% | 66% | 66% | 57% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59% | 58% | 51% | 53% | 60% | 50% | |
| Science Achievement | 65% | 63% | 51% | 60% | 63% | 50% | |
| Social Studies Achievement | 81% | 77% | 72% | 86% | 84% | 70% | |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Lo | Total | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|---------|---------|----------|
| mulcator | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 338 (0) | 358 (0) | 346 (0) | 1042 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 45 () | 49 () | 47 () | 141 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 11 (0) | 23 (0) | 37 (0) | 71 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 39 (0) | 28 (0) | 23 (0) | 90 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 81 (0) | 65 (0) | 92 (0) | 238 (0) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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 | | | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 65% | 63% | 2% | 54% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 60% | -5% | 52% | 3% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 61% | 59% | 2% | 52% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 51% | 13% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 74% | 68% | 6% | 56% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 71% | 5% | 58% | 18% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -2% | | | • | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 10% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | | | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 67% | 66% | 1% | 55% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 63% | -2% | 52% | 9% |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 59% | 54% | 5% | 54% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 56% | -6% | 54% | -4% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 78% | 76% | 2% | 46% | 32% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 77% | 1% | 45% | 33% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 0% | | | • | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 28% | | | | |

| | | | SCIENCE | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 64% | 62% | 2% | 48% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 65% | 66% | -1% | 50% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | | | | | | |

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| | | CIVIC | S EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 79% | 75% | 4% | 71% | 8% |
| 2018 | 82% | 75% | 7% | 71% | 11% |
| Co | ompare | -3% | | | |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| | | ALGEE | BRA EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 73% | 27% | 61% | 39% |

| | | ALGEE | RA EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 100% | 67% | 33% | 62% | 38% |
| Co | ompare | 0% | | | |
| | | GEOME | TRY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 66% | -66% | 57% | -57% |
| 2018 | 0% | 65% | -65% | 56% | -56% |
| Co | ompare | 0% | | | |

Subgroup Data

| | | 2019 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 31 | 50 | 51 | 33 | 45 | 41 | 26 | 61 | 70 | | |
| ELL | | 46 | | 27 | 57 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 77 | 66 | | 77 | 62 | | | 83 | 83 | | |
| BLK | 52 | 63 | 56 | 58 | 49 | 33 | 42 | 50 | 67 | | |
| HSP | 66 | 62 | 65 | 71 | 65 | 60 | 58 | 77 | 79 | | |
| MUL | 67 | 65 | 55 | 71 | 65 | 57 | 72 | 92 | 71 | | |
| WHT | 70 | 65 | 62 | 75 | 70 | 65 | 68 | 83 | 76 | | |
| FRL | 59 | 62 | 58 | 64 | 65 | 55 | 50 | 78 | 70 | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 37 | 47 | 43 | 34 | 47 | 43 | 34 | 56 | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 52 | 56 | 53 | 76 | 69 | | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | 83 | | 73 | 64 | | | | 80 | | |
| BLK | 59 | 61 | 55 | 56 | 63 | 54 | 41 | 65 | 84 | | |
| HSP | 59 | 54 | 44 | 64 | 66 | 69 | 72 | 72 | 33 | | |
| MUL | 66 | 57 | 50 | 65 | 62 | 65 | 71 | 87 | 59 | | |
| WHT | 67 | 61 | 48 | 72 | 67 | 61 | 67 | 84 | 61 | | |
| FRL | 55 | 54 | 43 | 60 | 62 | 58 | 59 | 77 | 28 | | |
| | | 2017 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | • | • |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 26 | 41 | 36 | 39 | 60 | 46 | 21 | 67 | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 50 | 46 | 25 | 45 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 56 | 56 | | 83 | 83 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 52 | 38 | 59 | 64 | 29 | 46 | 87 | 26 | | |
| HSP | 61 | 61 | 49 | 66 | 64 | 58 | 43 | 74 | 33 | | |
| MUL | 66 | 62 | 56 | 78 | 66 | 50 | 68 | 89 | 47 | | |
| WHT | 69 | 61 | 52 | 72 | 67 | 55 | 64 | 87 | 49 | | |

| | 2017 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| FRL | 57 | 54 | 49 | 60 | 62 | 50 | 47 | 79 | 28 | | |

ESSA Data

| This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019. | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Federal Index | |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 70 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 82 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 695 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 45 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 42 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 75 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 52 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 67 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 68 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 70 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 62 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Math - Lowest 25% - showed a 2% decrease. Discontinued using IXL Math last year in Intensive Math classes, due to that fact teachers did not feel it had a significant impact on scores. We currently utilize Kahn Academy and other non-computer based strategies with our Intensive students. We did

not feel our strategies achieved the goals we set 18-19 school year. The areas of difficulty overall in Math were expressions and equations.

Science - showed a 2% decrease in level 3-5; the area of most difficulty seems to continue to be Life Science. This has been a reoccurring problem.

ELA 7th grade showed 3% decrease in proficiency, This cohort group has shown a slight increase in proficiency but historically they have been significantly lower than previous groups. 8th grade showed a 2% decrease in proficiency. Discussion with Language Arts Teachers and dissection of scores indicates this decrease may have been a result of lower writing scores.

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

Math - lowest 25%. Discontinued using IXL Math last year, in Intensive Math classes, due to that fact teachers did not feel it had a significant impact on scores. We currently use Kahn Academy and other non-computer based strategies with our Intensive students this year; again we did not feel our strategies achieved the goals we set for the 18-19 school year. The overall areas of difficulty in Math were expressions and equations.

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.

None. We are above the state average in each area.

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

ELA Learning Gains showed an increase of 10%. This was due in great part to the increase of 6th grade in proficiency. Elective Critical Thinking Teachers increased the use of reading strategies in their plans.

ELA 6th grade showed a 10% increase from the previous year. Elective Critical Thinking Teachers increased the use of reading strategies in their plans.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The two areas which are of concern is Attendance below 90% and students with 4 or more indicators.

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

- 1. Math lowest 25%
- 2. Attendance
- 3. ELA 7/8 grade
- 4. Science particularly in the area of Life Science
- 5. Math Expressions and equations

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Math Gains Lowest 25%

Data Comparison showed a decline in the performance of students in the lowest 25%. Discontinued the use of IXL Math last year, in Intensive Math classes, due to that fact teachers did not feel it had a significant impact on scores. HNMS is now utilizing Kahn Academy and other non-computer based strategies with the Intensive students this year; again we did not feel our strategies achieved the goals we set for the 18-19 school year.

The overall areas of difficulty in Math were expressions and equations.

State the measurable outcome the school

plans to achieve

Rationale

Students in this subgroup will show a 10% increase in performance.

Person responsible

Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome

for

Restructure Intensive Math

Use the program "Freckles" program for math remediation.

Evidencebased Strategy Decrease student to teacher ratio. Spend time on reteaching/supporting general math class content.

Set up a reward system (eg. 4 days on task earn 20 minutes re-energize/focus time, since

these students

are not enrolled in PE.)

Rationale

for Evidence-

based Strategy In previous years we noticed that IXL Math had lost its effectiveness. Students are FSA tested on current material, so reteaching of some concepts may help comprehension.

Action Step

- 1. Schedule Intensive Class for students.
- 2. Collaborate with Math teachers to see what skills they are working on.

Description

- 3. Put a reward plan in place.
- 4. Monitor students closely to see if program is working.
- 5. If strategy not effective research alternatives.

Person Responsible

Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

| #2 | |
|--|--|
| Title | Attendance |
| Rationale | Although our overall attendance has improved, we still have 141 students who had below 90% attendance. We cannot improve in any area if the students are not here for us to teach. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The number of student who have less than 90% attendance will decrease by 25 students. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Implement truancy plan with fidelity. Provide a reward system through PBIS. Offer more before and after school clubs. Plan for dress-up days centered around school theme (Marvel universe). |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | Students' academic success is greatly impacted by attendance. We have noticed that students will come to school if they have a preferred activity scheduled for that day. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Implement truancy plan with fidelity. Establish a reward system in for improved attendance through PBIS program. Increase or maintain the number of before and after school clubs to encourage students to come to school. Advertise clubs. Place dress-up days on the calendar throughout the year. |
| Person Responsible | Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |

| #3 | |
|--|---|
| Title | ELA 7/8th grade |
| Rationale | 7th grade ELA proficiency scores dropped by 3%. 8th grade ELA proficiency scores dropped by 2%. (This year we will not have our 15 minutes of reading each day to change in schedule.) |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | 7th grade ELA scores will increase by 5%. (66% proficiency - target) 8th grade ELA scores will increase by 5%. (79% proficiency - target) |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Obtain 3 licenses for Mindplay for the lower students and ESOL students. (We will be rotating students.) Science and Social Studies teachers will sponsor vocabulary competitions every 9 weeks. We will continue our Sunshine Young Reader Award Books reward program. PE will adopt a bring a book to PE when it is raining and allow students to read when there is inclement weather. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | Research has shown effective results with Mindplay. Struggling readers usually have difficulty with scientific and historical vocabulary. The competition we hope will increase vocabulary skills and will positively impact comprehension. Increase reading time to offset doing away with the 15 minute reading period. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Obtain licenses (Mindplay) Schedule competitions Post and purchase Sunshine Young Reader Award titles Offer book passes to promote SYRA titles Add "Bring a book" to PE |
| Person Responsible | Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us) |
| | |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

ELA 7/8 grade - Increase reading strategies across all disciplines; focus on vocabulary in all disciplines; increase focus on word problems in Math.

Science - (Life Science) Several teachers have written grants to increase number of labs/projects to increase understanding of Life Science topics.

Math Equations/expressions - Teachers will take advantage of training on a new book series with attention to improving understanding of equations and expressions.