

Martin County School District

Sea Wind Elementary School



2020-21 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 | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Sea Wind Elementary School

3700 SE SEABRANCH BLVD, Hobe Sound, FL 33455

martinschools.org/o/swe

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Michels

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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) | 72% |
| 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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (44%) |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 | 20 |

Sea Wind Elementary School

3700 SE SEABRANCH BLVD, Hobe Sound, FL 33455

martinschools.org/o/swe

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">63%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53%</p> |

School Grades History

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

The SeaWind Family is dedicated to educating all students for success and fostering an atmosphere of caring, respectful, and responsible students who have a love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A dynamic educational system, striving for excellence in the total development of our future.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Burns-Wein, Rebecca | Instructional Coach | |
| Ressler, Stephanie | Teacher, K-12 | Academic Interventionist 3-5 |
| Bentz, Nancy | Teacher, K-12 | Science Lab grades 3-5, MTSS Coach |
| Carroll, Dayna | Assistant Principal | |
| Umbaugh, Jeffrey | Principal | Oversees all aspects of the school, including operations and instruction. |
| Sinclair, Emily | Instructional Coach | Behavior Interventionist/Coach |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Jennifer Michels

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.*

2

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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) | 72% |
| 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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (44%) |
| 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 | 79 | 82 | 88 | 93 | 99 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 531 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 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

Tuesday 10/27/2020

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 101 | 108 | 105 | 130 | 98 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 640 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 19 | 15 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |

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 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 55% | 58% | 57% | 59% | 59% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | 59% | 58% | 53% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | 56% | 53% | 43% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 71% | 65% | 63% | 66% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 79% | 65% | 62% | 68% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63% | 53% | 51% | 55% | 55% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 64% | 58% | 53% | 40% | 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 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 58% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 57% | 1% | 57% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 57% | 57% | 0% | 58% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 55% | -3% | 56% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 57% | 55% | 2% | 56% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 58% | -1% | 55% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 64% | 58% | 6% | 62% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 63% | 0% | 62% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 79% | 67% | 12% | 64% | 15% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 64% | 4% | 62% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 74% | 64% | 10% | 60% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 64% | -14% | 61% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 24% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 64% | 53% | 11% | 53% | 11% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 48% | 54% | -6% | 55% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| 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 | 28 | 45 | 50 | 43 | 64 | 67 | 40 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 63 | 61 | 49 | 76 | 63 | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 12 | 40 | | 41 | 68 | | 20 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 57 | 68 | 57 | 75 | 62 | 48 | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 68 | 73 | 84 | 85 | 69 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 58 | 68 | 61 | 73 | 62 | 51 | | | | |
| 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 | 28 | 52 | 53 | 37 | 52 | 45 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 47 | 40 | 29 | 45 | 27 | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 29 | 36 | 46 | 54 | 27 | 21 | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 40 | 31 | 38 | 48 | 37 | 16 | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 60 | 71 | 72 | 54 | 44 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 43 | 45 | 51 | 40 | 17 | 36 | | | | |
| 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 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 42 | 47 | 35 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 28 | 25 | 41 | 73 | 67 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 33 | 36 | 45 | 48 | 33 | 20 | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 35 | 33 | 50 | 65 | 68 | 27 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 64 | 52 | 75 | 74 | 65 | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 44 | 36 | 56 | 63 | 56 | 36 | | | | |

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 | 65 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 61 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 523 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|----------------------|--|
|----------------------|--|

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

| | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 48 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 36 |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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 | 76 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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.

Achievement levels for Black/African-Americans were the lowest: ELA (12%), Math (41%) and Science (20%). Our school personnel is indefinite of the contributing factors but it is noticed that behavior, attendance, and school related relationships could play a role. School personnel are focusing on this subgroup in 2019-20.

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

The ELA achievement level for Black/African-Americans showed the greatest decrease, from 30% (2018) to 12% (2019). Our school personnel is indefinite of the contributing factors but it is noticed that behavior, attendance, and school related relationships could play a role. School personnel are focusing on this subgroup in 2019-20.

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.

SWE went from a +1% gap when compared to the state average for 3rd grade ELA in 2018 to a -5% gap in 2019. Our school personnel is unsure of the contributing factors, but are taking steps (such as increasing high-interest readers in classrooms, ensuring a highly-functioning PLC, etc) to combat this dip.

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

Math Learning Gains increased by 27% from 2018 (52%) to 2019 (79%). SeaWind had interventionists working with students in the area of math. In addition, CLT's focused on building units around standards based instruction and implemented common assessments.

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

Two areas that we can address in our SIP are: behavior and Level 1's on FSA.

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

1. Overall 3-5 ELA Achievement
2. Overall 3-5 Math Achievement
3. Overall 3-5 Science Achievement
4. Black/African-American Achievement in ELA, Math, and Science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Overall in grades 3-5 ELA proficiency dropped 2% from 2017-18 to 2018-19. Due to gaps noted in fall (September 2020) iReady data there is evidence to support a need for continued improvement.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students achieving proficiency (level 3 and above) in ELA will increase from 55% to 60% on the Spring 2021 administration of FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will work collaboratively in CLTs to:
 1. Implement the K-2 phonics program, Foundations, with fidelity at the core. K-1 to use Geodes which align with scope and sequence of Foundations to build fluency through application of foundational skills.
 2. Plan for more oral language development opportunities through PLAYS in Kindergarten.
 3. Implement the K-1 phonological awareness curriculum, Heggerty, in the core.
 4. Identify common Tier 2, Tier 3, and academic vocabulary within each grade level to infuse into instruction.
 5. Plan standards based units and lessons around Reading and Writing Units of Study that include student monitoring strategies and differentiation components.
 6. Provide appropriately focused, tiered interventions for students showing need.

Phonological awareness, phonics, and oral language development are key indicators in a student's future academic success. Research supports that they are each critical to early childhood literacy skill development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Knowledge of words and direct vocabulary instruction are directly linked to student success in school.
 When the Reading and Writing Units of Study are implemented in conjunction with Foundations (K-2), Heggerty (K-1), and Words Their Way (3-5) students are exposed to a balanced literacy curriculum. Research has proven that Balanced Literacy guides students to be proficient, life-long readers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Coaching support through planning and modeling to ensure effective implementation of:
 - Foundations, Heggerty, Words Their Way, Reading/Writing Units of Study, PLAYS, Geodes
2. Coaches to facilitate intentional planning around standards when requested during CLTs.
3. Teams work during planning and CLTs to identify key vocabulary for instruction.
4. CLTs will focus within the 4 guiding questions weekly.
5. MTSS Core Team will support identifying students in need of support as well as in the use of appropriate materials and progress monitoring tools.
6. ELL Support to implement Foundations and Heggerty.
7. iReady Phonics for Reading for 4-5th graders struggling in the area of Phonics.

Person Responsible: Dayna Carroll (carrold@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although overall math proficiency has increased 10%, it is a school-wide goal to continuing improving instruction to increase overall math achievement. Due to gaps noted in fall (September 2020) iReady data there is evidence to support a need for continued improvement.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students achieving proficiency (level 3 and above) in math will increase from 71% to 76% on the Spring 2021 administration of FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will work collaboratively in CLTs to:
 1. Implement the MyMath/GoMath curriculum with fidelity at the core.
 2. Infuse NumberTalks and increase hands-on activities involving number sense and algebraic thinking.
 3. Utilize MAFS to ensure instruction of proper complexity level of standards.
 4. Identify common Tier 2, Tier 3, and academic vocabulary within each grade level to infuse into instruction.
 5. Plan standards based units and lessons that include student monitoring strategies and differentiation components.
 6. Provide appropriately focused, tiered interventions for students showing need.
 Units focused on grade level standards with questions written to, and asked at, the appropriate complexity is proven to better prepare students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research proves that hands-on and multi-sensory experiences that involve total physical response in working with numbers, will result in students of all learning styles and subgroups having a higher rate of proficiency with number sense and algebraic thinking.
 Knowledge of words and explicit vocabulary instruction are directly linked to student success in school.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School based and district coaching support with planning and modeling to ensure effective implementation of: MyMath, GoMath, MAFS, and NumberTalks
2. Instructional Coach to facilitate intentional planning around standards.
3. Grade level teams work during planning and CLTs to identify key vocabulary for instruction, remediation, and enrichment.
4. CLTs will focus within the PLC 4 guiding questions weekly to support student success.
5. MTSS Core Team will identify students in need of support and ensure teachers have access to appropriate materials and progress monitoring tools.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Overall science proficiency has grown by 14% from 50% to 64% but it remains a focus of the school to continue that trend and increase our 5th grade proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students achieving proficiency (level 3 and above) in science will increase from 64% to 69% on the Spring 2021 administration of FSSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will work collaboratively in CLTs to:

1. Implement district provided curriculum aligned with the standards.
2. Implement district provided common assessments across grade levels.
3. Utilize district provided experiments within the classrooms.
4. Plan with the Science Lab teacher to aid in planning standards based units, lessons and experiments.
5. Infuse science vocabulary across the content areas to increase exposure, with a focus on the Nature of Science vocabulary throughout the school year.

Implementing a research based, standards aligned curriculum with fidelity across the grade levels will increase student success and exposure to appropriate content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The use of common language, experiments, and assessments allows for our school to see trends and intervene as necessary, collaborating district wide when needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional Coach to assist in unit planning with teachers.
2. Instructional Coach will assist in ensuring teachers have access to the assessments.
3. Instructional support by Science lab teacher and instructional coach in 3-5 classrooms.

Person Responsible Rebecca Burns-Wein (burnsr@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus | |
| Description and Rationale: | Overall achievement in all subject areas has shown a decline from 2017-18 to 2018-19. |
| Measurable Outcome: | 41% or more of African-American/Black students will achieve proficiency (Level 3 or above) in all subject areas on the FSA and FSSA in Spring 2021. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate diverse literature in our read alouds and classroom libraries. 2. Participate in self-driven, continued research around strategies that help to boost engagement, relationships, structure, and connections with students. 3. Build a mentoring program that assists with social-emotional learning and helps to build strong relationships around campus, resulting in higher attendance and achievement. (Including peer buddies across grade levels when appropriate for reading.) 4. Implement CHAMPS/STOIC model into all classrooms to build relationships and maintain common language for all students. 5. Monitor attendance within this ESSA group, both traditional and remote students. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Building relationships is key in all classroom environments. Finding ways as a staff to boost climate and culture will spill over into the classrooms, lifting teachers up in finding new ways to bridge the cultural gap. A stronger relationship will result in stronger engagement. Having a school wide behavior management system will build respect and relationships all around campus. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff members will continue to increase cultural awareness through self-driven research and sharing out with CLTs.
2. Literacy coaches to research book titles that honor different cultures.
3. Select school staff to build a mentoring program that involves high needs students.
4. Trauma informed care to support all subgroups/students.
5. Increased PBIS awareness among staff/students, increase positive office referrals.
6. Walk-throughs to see CHAMPS implementation throughout the school.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

See plan

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.

At SeaWind Elementary, administration and leadership have made a point to build a positive culture and environment for all stakeholders. There have been surveys and meetings conducted to obtain an accurate picture of the needs from staff and parents. The data and information obtained has been used to make adjustments campus wide that both build culture and and work to improve student achievement. Teacher and staff are being provided with training to build classroom management, increasing student engagement and positive behavior. In addition, SeaWind Elementary typically hosts a variety of family events throughout the year. Our administration, parent liaison, school counselor, and social services worker work with individual families to offer additional school and community support.

SeaWind faculty and staff follow the district expectations of a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). This system helps to provide needed support with academic and behavioral needs. The school guidance counselor provides immediate counseling to assist students with behavioral concerns or circumstances, and provides referrals to agencies for more long-term needs. Outside agencies to include SunCoast and Treasure Coast Hospice provide group counseling to students in the areas of grief and social skills. The counselor and parent liaison also provide assistance to families in need of clothing, school supplies, or other material needs by providing information on available resources that are approved by the district. At times, select staff members provide a check-in/check-out session for students that need additional support in being accountable for their actions, providing incentives of a tangible or non-tangible nature. Our teachers and staff are continuing to receive professional development in Trauma Informed Care to support our students.

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 | | | | \$2,876.15 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0025 - Sea Wind Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,876.15 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Resources to support ELA instruction and increase student achievement.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$2,876.15 |

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
|----------|---------------|--|---|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0025 - Sea Wind Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,876.15 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Resources to support Math Instruction and increase student achievement.</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$2,876.15 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0025 - Sea Wind Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,876.15 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Resources to increase student achievement and support Science instruction.</i> | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American | | | | \$2,876.15 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0025 - Sea Wind Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,876.15 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Resources to support the achievement of our ESSA Subgroup and build cultural awareness.</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$11,504.60 |