

Broward County Public Schools

Nob Hill Elementary School



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 | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Nob Hill Elementary School

2100 NW 104TH AVE, Sunrise, FL 33322

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Traci Porter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 80% |
| 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (57%) |
| 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 | |

* 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 Broward 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Nob Hill Elementary School

2100 NW 104TH AVE, Sunrise, FL 33322

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 55% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 79% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | C | C | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Nob Hill Elementary is committed to providing students and their families with the best possible education. We strive to provide a safe, secure and authentically engaging learning environment that will allow our children to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Nob Hill Elementary fosters a high performing learning environment where students are encouraged to become critical thinkers and problem solvers through an interdisciplinary approach to learning.

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 |
|--------------------|----------------|---|
| Berisko, Sandra | ESE Specialist | Lead and support vision and mission of District and Nob Hill Elementary. Supervise and fully engage in the Strategic Plan of Nob Hill Elementary. Supervise and evaluate all School Staff, Teachers, Support Staff, Team Leaders/Leadership Team |
| Most, Heather | | Assist and support vision and mission of District and Nob Hill Elementary. Facilitator and Coach for instructional programs K-5. Facilitate the alignment of all curricular programs, instruction and assessment. Provide instructional support and monitor student achievement |
| Tucker, Angela | | Support students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile in reading. Support all students in grades 3-5 in Writing. Contribute to the MTSS/RTI meetings with data and intervention updates. Inservice facilitator for all teachers K-5. |
| Tardieu, Malecia | | Support students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile in reading and math. Contribute to the MTSS/RTI meetings with data and intervention updates. SAC Co-Chair, oversee the SIP. |
| Hernandez, Melissa | | Lead and support vision and mission of District and Nob Hill Elementary. Supervise and fully engage in the Strategic Plan of Nob Hill Elementary. Supervise and evaluate all School Staff, Teachers, Support Staff, Team Leaders/Leadership Team |
| Horowitz, Laura | | Support students in lowest quartile and RTI in Reading through pull-out intervention and collaboration with classroom teachers. |
| Feurtado, Natasha | | Support students in lowest quartile and RTI in Reading through pull-out intervention and collaboration with classroom teachers. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Traci Porter

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.*

3

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

531

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.

0

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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 | 83 | 110 | 101 | 102 | 100 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 585 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 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 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |

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 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 9/23/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 79 | 99 | 92 | 94 | 102 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 550 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 14 | 8 | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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 | 20 | 35 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

2020-21 - 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 | 79 | 99 | 92 | 94 | 102 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 550 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 14 | 8 | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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 | 20 | 35 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 60% | 59% | 57% | 58% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 63% | 60% | 58% | 57% | 57% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34% | 54% | 53% | 48% | 51% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 65% | 65% | 63% | 70% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 66% | 62% | 81% | 60% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 38% | 53% | 51% | 69% | 47% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 54% | 46% | 53% | 59% | 49% | 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 | 53% | 60% | -7% | 58% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 62% | -3% | 58% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 59% | 10% | 56% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 65% | -5% | 62% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 67% | -5% | 64% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 64% | 12% | 60% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 49% | 7% | 53% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady diagnostic data was used to progress monitor for the fall, winter and spring of the 2020-21 school year.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 69/75% | 69/83% | 74/67% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40/78% | 38/79% | 38/79% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/100% | 5/40% | 5/80% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/50% | 1/100% | 3/66% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 71/59% | 71/55% | 74/100% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41/61% | 40/53% | 40/62% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/40% | 5/20% | 5/70% |
| | English Language Learners | 3/33% | 3/0% | 3/33% |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 93/33% | 95/59% | 98/79% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 57/30% | 58/50% | 58/55% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10/30% | 11/55% | 11/63% |
| | English Language Learners | 4/25% | 4/25% | 4/100% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 94/26% | 95/41% | 94/66% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 57/21% | 58/41% | 58/48% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10/20% | 11/27% | 11/45% |
| | English Language Learners | 4/25% | 4/0% | 4/50% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 89/51% | 89/54% | 89/62% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49/45% | 48/48% | 48/50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14/36% | 14/36% | 14/35% |
| | English Language Learners | 5/80% | 5/80% | 5/60% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 89/23% | 89/42% | 89/52% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49/18% | 48/33% | 48/48 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14/21% | 14/21% | 14/35% |
| | English Language Learners | 5/0% | 5/0% | 5/20% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 91/63% | 91/69% | 93/81% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 50/56% | 49/67% | 51/75% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12/225% | 13/39% | 13/54% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/0% | 2/50% | 2/100% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 91/15% | 91/34% | 93/60% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 50/10% | 49/29% | 51/57% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12/8% | 13/15% | 13/31% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/0% | 2/0% | 2/0% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 88/42% | 89/49% | 89/58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40/35% | 41/37% | 41/45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18/28% | 19/32% | 20/30% |
| | English Language Learners | 9/22% | 9/22% | 8/50% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 89/22% | 89/30% | 89/64% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40/15% | 41/17% | 41/25% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17/18% | 19/26% | 20/40% |
| | English Language Learners | 9/22% | 9/0% | 8/63% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 80/17% | 80/30% | 76/34% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41/18% | 40/22% | 44/30% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17/10% | 18/15% | 22/15% |
| | English Language Learners | 9/15% | 8/18% | 9/22% |
| | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 20 | 36 | 60 | 34 | 60 | 50 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | | | 59 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 50 | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 45 | | 40 | 42 | 10 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 42 | | 66 | 50 | | 43 | | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 44 | | 49 | 56 | | 40 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 44 | 46 | 43 | 45 | 25 | 30 | | | | |
| 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 | 27 | 41 | 22 | 34 | 38 | 41 | 24 | | | | |
| ELL | 47 | 52 | 36 | 48 | 48 | 27 | 40 | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | | | 91 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | 60 | 43 | 58 | 53 | 44 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 55 | 59 | 22 | 63 | 57 | 29 | 47 | | | | |
| MUL | 57 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 72 | | 76 | 60 | | 83 | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | 64 | 33 | 61 | 55 | 38 | 46 | | | | |
| 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 | 11 | 39 | 46 | 36 | 66 | 67 | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 41 | | 59 | 72 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 53 | 45 | 58 | 75 | 67 | 52 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 50 | 35 | 70 | 78 | 75 | 55 | | | | |
| MUL | 56 | 36 | | 75 | 91 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 67 | | 83 | 90 | | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 57 | 46 | 66 | 79 | 67 | 55 | | | | |

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 | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 381 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 92% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 49 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 60 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 34 |
| 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 | 51 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 64 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 49 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 39 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?

ELA Students with disabilities component showed the lowest performance with 20% of students proficient.

This is a 7% decrease from previous data. However, the learning gains of the same group of students was significantly higher at 53% up from 39% in previous years. Overall math proficiency dropped from 70% to 51.7 in 2021 with a decrease of 18.3%.

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

The overall math proficiency and the ELA ESE subgroup proficiency show the greatest need for improvement based on the 2020-21 FSA scores.

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 decrease in Math proficiency and ELA ESE proficiency is directly related to the gap in face to face teaching during the end of the 19-20 school year when students were sent home to quarantine from Covid-19 as well as the return to virtual school for the first quarter of the 20-21 school year and

for more than half of our population staying 100% virtual through the end of the 2020-21 school year. New actions taking place to improve student achievement in these areas include the addition of two ESSR positions to support students who are struggling in addition to our 2 resource teachers and 2 ESE support facilitators.

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

Although there not any areas that showed a significant increase in scores from the last assessment prior to Covid-19 in 18-19, the ELA proficiency percentage stayed at 54.4% with only 1% drop despite the challenges with online learning and lack of face to face instruction.

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

Teachers at the school teach through an interdisciplinary approach that include ELA, Science and Social Studies standards. The teachers analyzed the ELA data and revised the curriculum to make revisions based on the ELA scores from the previous year. Increased progress monitoring through iReady also contributed to the improvement.

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

Professional learning communities focused on math and ELA will be implemented to impact teaching practices and in turn impact student achievement. Increased progress monitoring will take place and student progress will be monitored and discussed as an RTI/leadership team.

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.

Teachers will receive professional development on using the Broward County Schools reading plan to implement and progress monitor research based interventions to students receiving Tier II and III interventions. Teachers will also attend professional development on using specific programs such as Reading Horizons, Benchmark Advance, Heggerty and iReady as well as, the BEST standards to meet the needs of students.

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

In addition to our two resource teachers, we have an additional two ESSR resource teachers to meet the needs of our lowest performing students in reading and math. Extended learning opportunities will begin in the fall and a second session will take place in the winter and spring prior to state wide assessments.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | ESSA, Every Student Succeeds Act has identified the Students With Disabilities Subgroup as deficient due to a performance rating below 42%, (of 20%). |
| Measurable Outcome: | By June 2022, the Students With disabilities Subgroup will increase the performance rating to exceed 42% on the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA. |
| Monitoring: | SWD will be progressed monitored monthly using the iReady Growth Monitoring and Diagnostic assessment data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Traci Porter (traci.porter@browardschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Professional Learning Communities with be used to deliver Teacher Training and collaboration to refine teaching practices in Guided Reading and small group reading instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Guided Reading and Small Group Reading Instruction will increase student performance on the Florida Standards Assessment, as well as Benchmark Assessment Scores. |

Action Steps to Implement

Monitoring, scheduling, conducting IEP meetings and assessing the progress of goals and analyzing student data

Person Responsible Sandra Berisko (sandra.berisko@browardschools.com)

Administering, analyzing, and providing feedback using Iready diagnostic, working in collaboration with the reading coach and ESE support facilitators

Person Responsible Sandra Berisko (sandra.berisko@browardschools.com)

Providing opportunities for teacher professional development and training concerning best practices when working with SWD.

Person Responsible Sandra Berisko (sandra.berisko@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

The Literacy proficiency scores have historically hovered at 60% on average and the goal is to increase that proficiency in all grade levels. A systematic Quarterly Progress Monitoring data analysis process will be implemented to enhance teaching practices and student achievement. In addition an ongoing RTI/ MTSS process will address students response to interventions every six weeks to determine the outcome of the intervention.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

By June of 2022, the Literacy proficiency scores will be increased by 10 percentage points from 54.4 to 64.4 as measured by the 2021-22 Florida Standards Assessment Scores.

Monitoring:

Graphs from RTI data will be reviewed every 6 weeks in addition to quarterly assessment data.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Heather Most (heather.most@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Regularly scheduled RTI meetings every Tuesday to address the outcome of the interventions as well as data chats with leadership team once a quarter.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Ongoing progress monitoring ensures interventions are taking place with fidelity and changes are made if no progress is being observed.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitoring, scheduling, conducting RTI/CPST meetings and assessing the progress of goals and analyzing student data

**Person
Responsible**

Heather Most (heather.most@browardschools.com)

Administering, analyzing, and providing feedback using Iready diagnostic, working in collaboration with the reading coach, teacher, ESE support teacher, ESSR teacher and literacy resource teachers.

**Person
Responsible**

Heather Most (heather.most@browardschools.com)

Providing opportunities for teacher professional development and training concerning best practices in Benchmark Advance, small group differentiated instruction, and progress monitoring when working with all students in ELA.

**Person
Responsible**

Heather Most (heather.most@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), 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.

NOB HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Reported 0.8 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the high category. NOB HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-2671 ranked #877 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. This school ranked #88 / 116 elementary schools in the county. NOB HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-2671 reported 0.8 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Total Reported Suspensions 2019-2020 Statewide Rank: #602 / 1,395 | County Rank: #59 / 126 Suspensions per 100 Students: 1.5 Total Reported Suspensions: 10

Core Effectiveness Action Steps:

1. Data for incoming and returning student's risk factors will be pulled in BASIS
2. Students will be divided between all support staff
3. Support staff will meet individually with each student to create a prevention and intervention plan.
4. support staff will monitor and meet with students at least monthly. The support staff will refer students to CPST if there is no progress in risk factors or if a student receives more than 2 referrals.
5. A review of all student placements will be conducted at the start of the school year to identify at risk students.
6. Referral data will be reviewed monthly and teachers will be supported with behavioral management in-service.
- New students placed will be placed based on previous disciplinary information that is available.
7. Mentor Program to help students with behavioral needs.

Disproportionality Action Steps:

1. School will monitor the referrals each quarter during the 2021-22 school year.
2. Teachers with disproportionality in referrals written will be provided additional support from Administration.
3. Additional support from guidance Counselor via group sessions with students.
4. Parents of students with more than 5 referrals will be provided Social Worker support.

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.

Nob Hill Elementary is on a continuous quest to enhance our positive school culture and learning environment. All staff and students are supported and fully engaged with our stakeholder groups: PTA, SAC, SAF and the City of Sunrise Community. We continually strive to cultivate the positive culture. The school also completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP) for title I, which is available at the school site.

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

Nob Hill has built relationships with several businesses partners that promote a positive environment through donations for teacher incentives, rewards for the students and assist with Title I family nights.

The PTA at Nob Hill is also an active participant in the school culture. The PTA hosts monthly family nights at local restaurants to raise money for the school as well as, organize several social events and fundraisers for the students, teachers and parents.

Teachers and staff assist with Title I family nights and PTA social events.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--|---|-----------------|-----|---------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$7,740.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 6150 | | 2671 - Nob Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,564.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Title I parent involvement funds are used to promote parent participation in family night activities and provide resources for parents.</i> | | | |
| | | | 2671 - Nob Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$5,176.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Funds are used to purchase instructional materials for extended learning opportunities targeting SWD and lowest quartile.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$174,047.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5000 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 2671 - Nob Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$13,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Funds are used to purchase instructional materials in ELA in grades K-5 to increase student achievement.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 690-Computer Software | 2671 - Nob Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Funds used for Accelerated Reader program to promote reading throughout the school K-5</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 100-Salaries | 2671 - Nob Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$121,384.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salaries for primary (100%) and intermediate (53%) literacy resource teachers to support lowest quartile.</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------|------|--------------|--|-----------------|--|--------------|
| | 6400 | 100-Salaries | 2671 - Nob Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$16,503.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salaries for substitutes for teachers to attend professional development to increase student achievement</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 100-Salaries | 2671 - Nob Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$19,160.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salaries for teachers working in ELO camps</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$181,787.00 |