

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Martin - 0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

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: 9/2/2021

| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 68% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |

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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Martin - 0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

Hobe Sound Elementary School

11555 SE GOMEZ AVE, Hobe Sound, FL 33455

martinschools.org/o/hses

School Demographics

| School Type and Gra (per MSID F | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|------------------------------------|---------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Elementary So PK-5 | chool | Yes | | 58% |
| Primary Servic (per MSID F | •• | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Ed | ucation | No | | 45% |
| School Grades Histor | у | | | |
| Year Grade | 2020-21 | 2019-20 С | 2018-19 C | 2017-18 C |
| School Board Approv | val | | | |

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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Memmer Novak, Dianne | Principal | To manage the school operations 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 socialemotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance. |
| Martter, Nancy | 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 socialemotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance. She also address emotional and behavioral needs of students. |
| 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. |
| 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 socialemotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance. |
| Devoe, Stephanie | 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 socialemotional. Team members use their synergy to problem-solve. |
| Sharpe, Jennifer | Other | Assist with staffing and transition with ESE programs. In addition, 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 socialemotional. Team members use their synergy to problem- solve and provide recommendations to classroom teachers to garner strategies for improvement in student performance. |
| Pecci, Rengin | Psychologist | Asses students and oversee psych evaluations. Members also 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 |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------------------|---|
| | | and socialemotional. 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

Thursday 9/2/2021, 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.*

5

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.

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 30

Total number of students enrolled at the school 474

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year. 3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | | | | | Gra | de L | .ev | el | | | | | | Total |
|--|----|----|----|-----|-----|------|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 69 | 86 | 93 | 118 | 101 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 559 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Martin - 0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| 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 9/2/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| 70 | 83 | 70 | 82 | 87 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 480 |
| 18 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| | 70 18 1 0 0 0 | 70 83 18 9 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 | 10 83 70 18 9 12 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 10 10 10 70 83 70 82 18 9 12 13 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 23 | K 1 2 3 4 70 83 70 82 87 18 9 12 13 9 1 1 13 9 3 1 1 1 0 3 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 70 83 70 82 87 88 18 9 12 13 9 0 18 9 12 13 9 0 1 1 1 0 3 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 70 83 70 82 87 88 0 18 9 12 13 9 0 0 11 1 13 9 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 70 83 70 82 87 88 0 0 18 9 12 13 9 0 0 0 11 1 0 3 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 3 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 70 83 70 82 87 88 0 0 18 9 12 13 9 0 0 0 11 1 1 0 3 2 0 0 0 10 1 0 0 3 2 0 0 0 10 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 0 0 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 | K1234567897083708287880000189121390000001113320000011032000000100000000000000000000000230000000 | K12345678910708370828788000001891213900000001113900000000110320000000100000000000000000000000000230000000000 | K12345678910117083708287880000000189121390000000001113900000000001110000000000000100 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 70 83 70 82 87 88 0 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | I | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | eve | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | 2018 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Glade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 48% | 58% | 57% | 51% | 59% | 56% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 55% | 59% | 58% | 43% | 57% | 55% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48% | 56% | 53% | 34% | 49% | 48% | |
| Math Achievement | | | | 62% | 65% | 63% | 65% | 66% | 62% | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 65% | 62% | 58% | 59% | 59% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42% | 53% | 51% | 36% | 43% | 47% | |
| Science Achievement | | | | 54% | 58% | 53% | 60% | 59% | 55% | |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 54% | -10% | 58% | -14% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | · · · | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 57% | -7% | 58% | -8% |
| Cohort Co | nparison | -44% | | | • | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 55% | -7% | 56% | -8% |
| Cohort Co | nparison | -50% | | | · · | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 58% | 3% | 62% | -1% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 67% | -6% | 64% | -3% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -61% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 64% | -4% | 60% | 0% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -61% | | | · · · | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 53% | 1% | 53% | 1% | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready math and Benchmark Reading was used to compile the data used in this analysis. This data was based on the 2021-2022 fall assessments.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|------------------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 49% | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 9% | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 43% | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 43% NA | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 43% NA NA | Winter Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 43% NA NA NA | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 43% NA NA NA Fall | | |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 43% NA NA NA Fall 18% | | |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 46% | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | Na | | |
| | English Language Learners | Na | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 15% | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | Fall 47% | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 47% | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With | 47% NA | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | 47% NA NA | Winter Winter | Spring Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 47% NA NA NA | | |
| | ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantagedStudents WithDisabilitiesEnglish LanguageLearnersNumber/%ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantaged | 47% NA NA NA Fall | | |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 47% NA NA NA Fall 35% | | |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 46% | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | | |
| 7 4 60 | Students With Disabilities | NA | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22% | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | NA | | |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 18 | 32 | 25 | 23 | 16 | 8 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 37 | | 37 | 44 | | 25 | | | | |
| BLK | 9 | 17 | | 23 | 10 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 31 | 45 | 50 | 40 | 47 | | 41 | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 57 | | 66 | 59 | | 82 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 48 | 38 | 38 | 43 | 26 | 44 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 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 | | | | |

| | | 2019 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | |
| 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 | | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 376 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subaroun Doto | |

Subgroup Data Students With Disabilities Federal Index - Students With Disabilities Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% English Language Learners Federal Index - English Language Learners

| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 38 |
|--|-----|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

23

YES

Martin - 0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

| Native American Students | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | | | | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| 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% | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | | | | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 15 | | | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | | | | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 44 | | | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| Multiracial Students | | | | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | | | | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| White Students | | | | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 66 | | | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | | | | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 41 | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The areas of focus for the 2021-2022 School Improvement plan includes raising the overall proficiency of all students in Reading, Math and Science. It is the goal of Hobe Sound Elementary to raise the proficiency level of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black students. Another goal is to increase the Learning Gains made by all subgroups as well as the lowest 25%. By raising the achievement of all students, the gains made by students in the various subgroups will be increased. ESE,ELL, and Black students did not perform as well on the most recent FSA assessment as compared to 2019. In ELA, Reading Comprehension, Vocabulary, Fluency and Phonics components play a great role in achievement and the path to proficiency. In Mathematics, Analyzing Word Problems, Multiplication/Division and Algebraic concepts also play a great role in achievement and assist students in reaching proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Raising the proficiency rate of ESE, ELL and Black students is our greatest need for improvement. Also, raising the Learning Gains of this group is a top priority. As we compaired data from the 2019 FSA, there was a drop in performance on 2021 FSA in Reading and Math.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The following are factors for improvement: a lack of exposure to prerequisite skills and concepts, preschool experience and continued practice. Providing tutoring opportunities as well as partner with after care programs to support academic practice, will help raise student achievement and proficiency in the tested areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science has shown the most improvement. Third grade reading as well as Fifth grade reading and math increased from 2019.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Ensuring the schedule meets the needs of students and utilizing interventionist to support students during intervention time. Paras have been utilized to support students and assist teachers to help with the delivery of lesson content or targeted practice. Tutoring students and providing such opportunities in Reading and Math.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Analyze data and ensure skills are taught in small groups and reinforced during intervention time. Provide tutoring opportunities and implement the reading curriculum with fidelity.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

There will be professional development with Benchmark Reading, Science and Math. Professional Development and content overviews will be conducted by curriculum supervisors to support classroom instruction.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continue to create a schedule that supports ESE and students in the MTSS system. Strategically place resources where they will have the greaterst impact on students (falilitations, paras, interventionist).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | additional goal is to increase student proficiency for targeted subgroups (ESE, ELL, and | | |
| Measurable Outcome: | The ELA measurable outcome for HSE is to increase grades 3-5 student proficiency from 53% to 58%. 2. We will also increase SWD proficiency from 23% to 28%, 3. Increase Black student's proficiency from 32% to 37% 4.increase the proficiency of students on formative assessments by 5% 5. Increase the proficiency of students in the bottom quartile on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment Test. Provide tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students. | | |
| Monitoring: | Weekly walkthroughs and review of assessment data will serve as indicators in monitoring the success of the strategies being implemented. | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Dianne Memmer Novak (memmerd@martin.k12.fl.us) | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | Follow Benchmark curriculum. Utilize elements from the curriculum, formative assessments, and monitor student achievement. Continue the use of SPIRE for the subgroup SWD. Continue small group instruction and use of Foundations to bolster spiraling elements. Some subgroups have shown a decrease in English Language Arts performance from 2019. Thus, it is the goal to improve student achievement by raising the proficiency rate through the utilization of the Benchmark 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. Utilization of the formative assessment component to gauge achievement with this 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 Stone | to Implement | | |

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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, phonics, phonemic awareness, oral language, literacy beginnings. 2. Meet in PLC Groups to discuss and implement the following strategies: Require a 160 minute block for reading that includes both whole group and small group instruction in Benchmark. 3. PD on engagement strategies. 4. Continue data chats K-5. Create digital data wall for lowest 25%. Focus grade 3-5 on using item specs to create formative assessments. 5. Create mentoring program for at risk students 6. Increase use of visuals and graphic organizers for ESE/ELL/LQ 6.. Incorporate Academic Vocabulary Strategies. Implement school-wide schedule to place additional supports for identified students. 7. Weekly Admin walkthroughs. 8. Provide tutoring opportunities to increase achievement.

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

| | ······································ | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | An area of focus is to increase student proficiency in Mathematics. In addition, increase the percentage of students making a learning gain on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment Test. Subgroups have shown a decrease in performance from 2019. An additional goal is to increase student proficiency for targeted subgroups (ESE, ELL, and Black students). Increase proficiency by providing tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students | | | |
| Measurable Outcome: | Students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in the area of Mathematics from 49% to 55%. 2.In addition, HSE will increase the percentage of Black students meeting proficiency from 10% to 23%, 3. Increase proficiency of students making a learning gain from 49%-55%. 4 Increase the percentage of students in the bottom quartile making learning gains in math by 6% from 35%-41%. 5. Increase proficiency of students on formative assessments by 5%. 6. Increase the proficiency of students in the bottom quartile on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment Test. | | | |
| Monitoring: | Weekly walkthroughs and the review of assessment data will serve as indicators in monitoring the success of the strategies being implemented. | | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Willie Gore (gorew@martin.k12.fl.us) | | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | 1. The utilization of the Go Math curriculum 2. Hands on Equations (grades4-5) 3. Simple Solutions 4. Differentiated instruction 5. Small group work with Data driven lessons 6. 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 concepts, 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 Interventionist will observe Individual data chats with students and classroom teacher. Walkthroughs to ascertain instruction effectiveness. Provide tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students. | | | |
| | | | | |

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 (number meanings, addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, algebraic concepts). 2. Meet in PLC Groups to discuss and implement the following strategies: working with simple solutions and Hands-on Equations. 3. PD on engagement strategies. 4. Continue data chats K-5. Create digital data wall for lowest 25%. Focus grade 3-5 on using item specs to create formative assessments. 5. Create mentoring program for at risk students 6. Increase use of visuals and graphic organizers for ESE/ELL/LQ. 7. Incorporate Academic Vocabulary Strategies. Implement school-wide schedule to place additional supports for identified students. 5 Weekly Admin walkthroughs 8. Provide tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students.

Person

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

#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 2022 Florida Statewide Science Standards Assessment Test. Students showed an increase in the number of students proficient in Science 2019. The targeted subgroups are ELL, Black, and Students with Disabilities. Increase proficiency by providing tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Measurable Outcome: | Students will increase proficiency on the 2022 Statewide Science Assessment Test from 63% to 68%. In addition, we will see an increase in the proficiency of Students with Disabilities from 20% to 26%. 2. HSE plans to increase the proficiency of ELL students from 25% to 31% on the Statewide Science Assessment Test. 3. Increase the proficiencyof students on science formative assments by 5%. 4. Provide tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students. | | |
| Monitoring: | Science will be monitored by reviewing formative and summative data on common and district assessments. Classroom observation and periodic Science walkthroughs will be used to measure instructional effectiveness. | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Willie Gore (gorew@martin.k12.fl.us) | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | Monitor student performance on Formative Assessments and District Assessments. The Science Lead teacher will meet with each 5th grade class once a week to conduct a lab. As the class meets with the lab teacher the lab will be centered around a review of 3rd and 4th grade material and emphasize 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 labs. | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | Monitor student performance on Formative and District Assessments. The Science Lead teacher will conduct a lab once a week for 5th grade. As the class meets with the lab teacher the lab will be centered around a review of 3rd and 4th grade material and push 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 Stone | to Implement | | |

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 available assessments in Science to measure growth and target specific standards. 6. Provide tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Discipline was down by 58% from the previous year with the bulk of incidents occuring during recess or unstructured times. The contiinued use of PBIS and CHAMPS will be followed. There will be monthly data analysis conducted to monitor progress, Classroom review of schoolwide rules will be reinforced and PBIS incentives will be given to encourage positive behavior.

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.

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 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 de escalation interventions to students within the classroom. This technique providesimmediate interventions to help deescalate students in a crisis state. Students who need more intensive social-emotional interventions are seen by a contracted licensed counselor. Members of the community are invited to the parent events. Thus, members of the community are sought to serve on SAC and share their perspective and observations of the school. PBIS also provides incentives and drawinfs to promote a positive school culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

See section A for an overview and analysis of positive culture and environment of HSE.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$1,000.00 |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|----------------|------------|------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School | | | \$1,000.00 |
| | Notes: Tutoring and Misc. Supplies | | | | | |
| 2 | 2 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | | \$1,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School | | | \$1,000.00 |
| | Notes: Tutoring and Misc. Supplies | | | | | |
| 3 | 3 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | | \$500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0111 - Hobe Sound Elementary School | | | \$500.00 |
| Notes: PD and Misc. Supplies | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | \$2,500.00 | |