
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Hilliard Elementary School

27568 OHIO ST, Hilliard, FL 32046

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Celena Loudermilk

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 61% |
| 2019-20 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 | 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

* 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 | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Hilliard Elementary School

27568 OHIO ST, Hilliard, FL 32046

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 62% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 12% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| 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.

Our mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hilliard Elementary is committed to an educational process, involving the total community, which encourages each child to become a lifelong learner and provides the necessary resources to enable each student to develop into a responsible, productive citizen prepared to enter secondary education with both academic and social success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Loudermilk, Celena | Principal | |
| Tilley, Rhonda | School Counselor | |
| Graves, Donna | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Sims, Jacquelin | Assistant Principal | |
| Tomberlin, Lauren | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Nicks, Autumn | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Starling, Karen | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Graves, Patricia | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Vanzant, Christie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Carter, Latasha | Teacher, ESE | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Celena Loudermilk

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 61% |
| 2019-20 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 | 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 102 | 98 | 105 | 110 | 109 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 622 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 13 | 15 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/19/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 102 | 119 | 118 | 104 | 107 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 681 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 24 | 16 | 13 | 20 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 102 | 119 | 118 | 104 | 107 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 681 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 24 | 16 | 13 | 20 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 78% | 76% | 57% | 78% | 73% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 65% | 65% | 58% | 64% | 64% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | 54% | 53% | 45% | 49% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 91% | 85% | 63% | 83% | 82% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 79% | 77% | 62% | 57% | 71% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 82% | 67% | 51% | 59% | 64% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 76% | 75% | 53% | 79% | 73% | 51% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (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.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 78% | 75% | 3% | 58% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 76% | -4% | 57% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 76% | 68% | 8% | 58% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 69% | -2% | 56% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 79% | 75% | 4% | 56% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 77% | 71% | 6% | 55% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 89% | 83% | 6% | 62% | 27% |
| | 2018 | 89% | 80% | 9% | 62% | 27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 85% | 81% | 4% | 64% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 91% | 83% | 8% | 62% | 29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 96% | 86% | 10% | 60% | 36% |
| | 2018 | 87% | 79% | 8% | 61% | 26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 75% | 73% | 2% | 53% | 22% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 80% | 72% | 8% | 55% | 25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 | 65 | 54 | 67 | 85 | 66 | 93 | 53 | | | | |
| BLK | 67 | 30 | | 93 | 80 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | 50 | | 83 | 83 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 67 | 64 | 92 | 79 | 82 | 77 | | | | |
| FRL | 76 | 63 | 60 | 89 | 78 | 80 | 76 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 60 | 63 | 72 | 82 | 80 | 78 | 42 | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | 62 | 57 | 90 | 72 | 70 | 85 | | | | |
| FRL | 65 | 53 | 49 | 86 | 72 | 76 | 73 | | | | |
| 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 |
| SWD | 35 | 23 | 10 | 54 | 45 | 32 | 47 | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 75 | | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 63 | 46 | 85 | 56 | 55 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 72 | 57 | 47 | 78 | 56 | 55 | 73 | | | | |

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 | 76 |
| 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 | |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 531 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 69 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 68 |
| 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 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 69 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 77 |
| 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 | 75 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

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.

Our ELA Lowest 25th percentile was the lowest scoring component at 60%. This was up from 52% last year

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

Our Science Achievement was the only component that dropped any at all. Science went from 81% to 76%.

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.

All of our data components were well above the state averages. It is a pretty common trend that our components are always above the state averages.

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

The components that demonstrated the most improvement were the lowest 25th percentiles in ELA and Math. We continued small group instruction and differentiation.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance continues to be an area of concern. We feel that students academic will improve if attendance improves.

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

1. ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains with special attention on the Lowest quartile
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | 2018-19 ELA Achievement was 78% and our ELA Gains were 65% (60% for the lowest quartile) We want to continue to increase the ELA achievement and gains. |
| Measurable Outcome: | By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, Hilliard Elementary School will increase our overall ELA achievement and ELA gains by 3-5%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Celena Loudermilk (loudermilk.ce@nassau.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | To implement intentional differentiated ELA instruction based on data from diagnostic assessment to progress monitor achievement and growth. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Based on a plethora of assessments (I-Ready, STAR Literacy, FSA data, LEXIA Core, Progress Monitoring, etc.), the data shows a need for continued adjustments for growth in ELA. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Differentiated small group instruction
2. Targeted in school intervention
3. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS
4. After school tutoring
5. Collaborative Planning and professional development

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 attendance data, 15 % of HES students did not maintain a 90% attendance rate. According to the first quarter attendance data for 2020, HES is demonstrating that 9 % of students are not maintaining a 90% attendance rate. It appears that our attendance is improving, however it appears that the 2020 enrollment for Hilliard Elementary School has decreased by 59 students.

Measurable Outcome: At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, the goal of HES is to decrease the percentage of students absent for more than 10% of the school year by 2%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Celena Loudermilk (loudermilk.ce@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will increase parent communication of the attendance policy and progress towards desired goals using positive classroom and school wide reinforcers regarding attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: It is evident that parent/student communication and reinforcement is needed to stress the importance of attendance and the correlation to student achievement data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. 2-day absenteeism follow-up calls
2. Positive celebrations for students who maintain perfect attendance
3. Increase parent awareness of attendance policy
4. Home visits and parent-teacher conferences regarding poor attendance.
5. Tiered system of support including: letters, phone calls, and building positive relationships.

Person Responsible Jacquelin Sims (simsja@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Hilliard Elementary School identifies ELA as the focus this year, but will continue to monitor math achievement data based on diagnostic assessments from iReady.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

School staff, faculty, and administrators strive to strengthen parent involvement in the school. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies including community involvement opportunities and business partnerships.

The school will provide the coordination, technical assistance, and other support necessary to assist in planning and implementing effective and comprehensive parent involvement programs, based on the National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Programs, which include:

The school will provide the coordination, technical assistance, and other support necessary to assist in planning and implementing effective and comprehensive parent involvement programs, based on the National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Programs, which include:

- A. Communication between home and school is regular, two-way and meaningful.
- B. Responsible parenting is promoted and supported.
- C. Parents play an integral role in assisting student learning. The School will help parents understand the state's academic standards, student progression requirements, and how to monitor their children's progress.
- D. Parents are welcome in school, treated with courtesy and respect, and their support and assistance are sought.
- E. Parents are full partners in the decisions that affect children and families.
- F. Community resources are utilized to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning.

The school will communicate parental choices and responsibilities to parents. Emphasis will be placed on active parent involvement at each school. The following are examples of family and community involvement communication:

- Open House and Parent Nights (STEAM, Literacy)
- School Web Page
- Focus
- Newsletters communicating classroom and school news to parents
- Parent phone calls, Blackboard, conferences, Remind, school marquee

All stakeholders are invited to attend PTO meetings and SAC meetings to provide feedback and participate in conversations regarding involvement opportunities and academic achievement.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |