Martin County School District

Hobe Sound Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hobe Sound Elementary School

11555 SE GOMEZ AVE, Hobe Sound, FL 33455

martinschools.org/o/hses

Demographics

Principal: Diane Memmer Novak

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2020

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)	68%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Martin 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

Hobe Sound Elementary School

11555 SE GOMEZ AVE, Hobe Sound, FL 33455

martinschools.org/o/hses

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	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Hobe Sound Elementary's mission is to Educate all students for success, while encouraging positive behavior patterns in our school community by teaching and reinforcing school-wide expectations.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hobe Sound Elementary's vision is to provide a dynamic educational system of excellence. The HSE eagle community soars to greater heights by continuously striving to promote academic, social, and emotional growth. We are a team of students, teachers, parents, and community members working cooperatively to create a positive, safe, and successful environment.

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
Memmer Novak, Dianne	Principal	To manage the school and culture. The principal also is responsible for the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Gore, Willie	Assistant Principal	Members have expertise in academic or support services within the school. Members offer their expertise in their area as it pertains to the whole student both academic and social-emotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance.
Slavin, Mary	Instructional Coach	Members have expertise in academic or support services within the school. Members offer their expertise in their area as it pertains to the whole student both academic and social-emotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance.
Elliott, Jan	Instructional Coach	Members have expertise in academic or support services within the school. Members offer their expertise in their area as it pertains to the whole student both academic and social-emotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance.
Patel, Kara	Instructional Coach	Her role is to assist teachers and students as well as ensure the implementation of the School Improvement Members have expertise in academic or support services within the school. Members offer their expertise in their area as it pertains to the whole student both academic and social-emotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance.
Casady, Ruth	School Counselor	Members have expertise in academic or support services within the school. Members offer their expertise in their area as it pertains to the whole student both academic and social-emotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance.
Devoe, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Members have expertise in academic or support services within the school. Members offer their expertise in their area as it pertains to the whole student both academic and social-emotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/10/2020, Diane Memmer Novak

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

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)	68%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	70	83	70	82	87	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	18	9	12	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	5	4	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	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	0	0	0	91	94	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	275
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	91	94	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	275
Attendance below 90 percent	22	11	12	12	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	48%	58%	57%	55%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	59%	58%	59%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	56%	53%	53%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	65%	63%	67%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	65%	62%	67%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	53%	51%	57%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	58%	53%	57%	55%	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	44%	54%	-10%	58%	-14%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	48%	55%	-7%	56%	-8%
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	58%	3%	62%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	63%	3%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	67%	-6%	64%	-3%
	2018	62%	64%	-2%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	60%	64%	-4%	60%	0%
	2018	62%	64%	-2%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	23	48	50	38	59	43	8				
ELL	21	50	52	38	55	52	27				
BLK	32	33	27	53	42						
HSP	33	58	57	51	63	55	48				
WHT	58	60	55	69	58	27	56				
FRL	36	47	42	53	52	44	47				

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	24	27	23	34	32	18					
ELL	24	50	54	45	54	42					
BLK	42	40		58	44		43				
HSP	30	48	62	52	61	50	54				
MUL	70										
WHT	59	42	29	71	62	40	64				
FRL	41	40	35	59	55	43	57				

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	26	50	50	38	63						
ELL	24	45	46	41	61	70	33				
BLK	39	43		61	67		40				
HSP	36	44	43	57	62		35				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	64	65	65	72	69	62	70				
FRL	46	50	52	59	65	57	49				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	55
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	45
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.

The data shows that 44% of 3rd grade students scored at proficiency level or above on the ELA assessment. This is the area with the lowest performance when compared to other grade levels and other subject areas. Factors that contributed to this data include low reading comprehension levels, low fluency levels, and low vocabulary skills within this grade level.

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

The data shows that the greatest decline was in grade 3 Reading with 44% proficiency versus 55%. However, in 5th grade Science, In 2018, 61% of students scored at proficiency level or higher compared to 54% of students in 2019. This is a 7% decrease in students scoring at proficiency level. A factor that contributed to this decline includes students difficulty with reading comprehension.

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.

3rd grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the State Average. HSE 3rd grade ELA proficiency level for 2019 was 44% and the state average was 58% making there a difference in students proficiency 14%. Factors that contributed to this include low student fluency and low student reading comprehension. Students need explicit instruction on how to utilize test taking strategies to build their comprehension of the text.

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

HSE Students with Disabilities had the 2nd highest learning gains in the school district. In ELA, 48% of Students with Disabilities had learning gains and of that subgroup, 23% of the students scored at proficiency level. In Math 50% of SWD had learning gains and 38% scored at proficiency level. In 2020 additional support was given to these students by providing small group instruction, building their test taking strategies, and scaffolding their reading skills through the utilization of SPIRE. This strategy will be ongoing.

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

After analyzing the EWS data a potential area of concern is 3rd grade ELA proficency levels. Twenty three students scored a level 1 on the state assessment. A second area of concern is while our subgroups are making learning gains they are still not scoring a level 3 or more on their state ELA assessment. In following those students, further analysis is needed to ensure deficiencies are addressed.

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

1. Increase reading comprehension through all grade levels.
2. Increase vocabulary in ELA, Math, and Science.
3. Continue promoting learning gains in the subgroups, while helping them reach proficiency level on ELA.

4. Increase students ability to utilize test taking strategies in all academic areas.
5. Increase student retention of Science content.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	An area of focus is to increase student proficiency in the area of English Language Arts. In addition, Increase the percentage of students making a learning gain on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment Test. Students have shown a decrease in English Language Arts performance from 2019-2020 Thus,the goal is to improve student achievement by raising the proficiency rate on the ELA assessment. An additional goal is to increase student learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	The ELA measurable outcome for HSE is to increase grades 3-5 student proficiency from 48% to 53%. We will also increase SWD proficiency from 23% to 28%, and increase Black student's proficiency from 32% to 37% on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment Test.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dianne Memmer Novak (memmerd@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Follow proof of concept curriculum. Utilize elements from Luck Calkins to guide instruction and monitor curriculum achievement. Continue the use of SPIRE for the subgroup SWD. Continue small group instruction. iready ELA and Simple Solutions will be used to bolster instruction. Students have shown a decrease in English Language Arts performance from 2018-2019. Thus, it is the goal to improve student achievement by raising the proficiency rate through the utilization of the proof of concept curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This curriculum provides structured reading instruction for students. It also allows students to build reading skills through the use of explicit reading activities. Lucy Calkins elements will be infused into the proof of concept curriculum making it a cohesive Reading Instruction tool. SPIRE is a researched based reading intervention program that data has shown improves our SWD reading skills. Additional small group instruction will assist struggling readers with scaffolding reading skills throughout the year.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase expertise of teachers by providing Professional Development
and support with interventionist , grade level pace setters, PD in differentiated small group instruction based on data (guided reading, strategy lessons, shared reading, concepts of print, phonics,phonemic awareness, oral language, literacy beginnings, Continuum of Literacy Learning) 2. K-5 Focus on a transference of skills into text. Interventionist will work with teams on standards based instruction that infuses item spec question stems, and formative assessments based on item specs into the reading block. 3. PD on engagement strategies. Continue data chats K-5. Create digital data wall for lowest 25%. Focus grade 3-5 on using item specs to create formative assessments. Reading Interventionist work in classrooms to set up small groups based on data thus provide strategies to teachers. Increase use of visuals and graphic organizers for ESE/ELL/BQ 4.Incorporate Academic Vocabulary Strategies. Implement school-wide schedule to place additional supports for identified students

Person Responsible	Dianne Memmer Novak (memmerd@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	An area of focus is to increase student proficiency in the area of Mathematics. In addition, Increase the percentage of students making a learning gain on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment Test. 2018-2019. Thus, it is the goal to improve student achievement by raising the proficiency rate. Also, a goal is to increase the number of students making learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in the area of Mathematics from 62% to 67%. In addition, HSE will increase the percentage of ELL students meeting proficiency from 38% to 43%, Increase proficiency of Students with Disabilities from 38% to 43% on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment Test.This is based on previous data and trends.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Willie Gore (gorew@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The utilization of: 2. Go Math curriculum 3. Number Talks 4. Hands on Equations 5. Simple Solutions 6. Differentiated instruction 7. Small group work with Data driven lessons 8. iready Math lessons
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for utilizing these evidence-based strategies is to increase student achievement in numbers and operations, algebra, algebraic thinking, measurement, and geometry. The following process will be used to monitor the goal: Ongoing Data meetings with PLT and MTSS as well as a review of diagnostic data from iReady and formative assessments. Admin and academic coaches observe Individual data chats with students by the classroom teacher.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue work with Math workshop and small group differentiated math instruction based on data (remediate, reteach, enrich) K-5. 2. Continue work with Simple Solutions. Use Hands On Equations 3-5. 3. Math Interventionist will work with teams on standards based instruction that infuses item spec question stems, Continue data chats K-5. Create data wall for lowest 25%. Math coach to facilitate PLTs with grade 3-5 on using item specs to create formative assessments. 4. Math Interventionist to work in classrooms to set up small groups based on data and provide strategies to teachers.Data chats/goal setting with students. 5. Create mentoring program for at risk students. Implement school-wide schedule to ensure additional supports to this subgroup. 6.Interventionist to work with teachers who need the most support. 7. Label classrooms in phrases in English and Spanish/Portuguese for students. 8. Formative assessments based on item specs for math 9. Tutoring to increase achievement.

Person Responsible	Willie Gore (gorew@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	An area of focus is to increase student proficiency in the area of Science. In addition, increase student proficiency of targeted subgroups on the 2021 Florida Statewide Science Standards Assessment Test. Students showed a decrease in the number of students proficient in Science 2018-2019. The goal is to increase the proficiency rate overall. In addition HSE will increase the proficiency of students in the subgroup of ELL and Students with Disabilities.This data has continued to trend in this direction.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will increase proficiency on the 2021 Statewide Science Assessment Test from 54% to 63%. In addition, we will see an increase in the proficiency of Students with Disabilities from 8% to 31%. HSE plans to increase the proficiency of ELL students from 27% to 32% on the Statewide Science Assessment Test.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Devoe (devoes@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitor student performance on Common Assessments and District Assessments. The Science Lead teacher will meet with each 5th grade class twice a week to conduct a lab. The first day the class meets with the lab teacher the lab will be centered around a review of 3rd and 4th grade Science standards. The second days lab will be centered around 5th grade standards. The Science Lead teacher will also push into the classroom to provide additional support (build vocabulary and build retention of standards). The Science lead teacher will support Science by having students complete District recommended Science Tutorials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitor student performance on Common and District Assessments. The Science Lead teacher will conduct a lab twice a week for 5th grade. The first day the class meets with the lab teacher the lab will be centered around a review of 3rd and 4th grade Science standards. The second days lab will be centered around 5th grade standards. The Science Lead teacher will also push into the classroom to provide additional support (build vocabulary and build retention of standards). These strategies will increase proficiency on the State Science Assessment. PLT groups will further assess the strength and weaknesses of students in the area of science. Teachers will use this data to reteach and reassess students. Hands on labs taught by the Science Lead and classroom teacher.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide lead teacher support/coaching on incorporating labs and higher order thinking into lessons (Inquiry Based/general Lessons). 2. Grade level pace setters will work with teams on standards based instruction that infuses item spec question stems, and formative assessments based on item specs into the science block. 3. Interventionist will work with small groups of students to utilize science readers for small group instruction to increase ability to read like a scientist and increase academic vocabulary. 4. Continue PD on engagement strategies. 5. Utilize Science available assessments to measure growth and target specific standards.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An area of focus is to increase student proficiency in the area of Mathematics. In addition, Increase the percentage of students making a learning gain on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment Test. The leadership team will enlist the support of a District Coach and monitor formative data.

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.

Hobe Sound Elementary has various parent involvement and family activities that promote a positive school culture and allow interactions between students and families. These activities are both social and academic and are sponsored by PTA or via the Parent Involvement team. Such activities are Literacy Night, Math Night and STEAM Night (virtual activities pending CDC guidelines) Hobe Sound Elementary has established school-wide expectations that are designed to create a positive learning environment based on demonstrating appropriate behavior and taking responsibility for one's actions. School-wide expectations are posted in all areas of the school and are specific to a given area. Expectations are taught, reviewed and reinforced by teachers and staff. HSE follows the state's MTSS process when meeting the social-emotional needs of students. Members of the crisis team have been trained to provide deescalation interventions to students within the classroom. This technique provides immediate interventions to help deescalate students in a situation. Students who need more intensive social-emotional interventions are seen by a contracted licensed counselor. Members of the community are invited to the aforementioned parent events. Thus members of the community are sought to serve on SAC and share their perspective and observations of the school.

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**				**$2,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

			0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$2,000.00
			Notes: Tutoring, materials/supplies			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$2,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$2,000.00
			Notes: Tutoring, materials/supplies			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$1,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,500.00
			Notes: Material/supplies			
					Total:	**$5,500.00**