Martin County School District

Sea Wind Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/5/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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	ATSI
* 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

Sea Wind Elementary School

3700 SE SEABRANCH BLVD, Hobe Sound, FL 33455

martinschools.org/o/swe

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		A	A

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.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A dynamic educational system of excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Michels, Jennifer	Principal	
Carroll, Dayna	Assistant Principal	
Ressler, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	
Sinclair, Emily	Instructional Coach	
Bentz, Nancy	Science Coach	
Sercia, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Durst, Christine	Teacher, ESE	
Bellonio, Kim	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/5/2022, Jennifer Michels

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
29

Total number of students enrolled at the school
499

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	80	90	89	84	95	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545
Attendance below 90 percent	35	24	23	31	30	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	4	1	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	31	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	32	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	10	16	22	30	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	1	0	22	32	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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

Monday 8/29/2022

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	87	90	94	98	107	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	15	21	28	22	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	25	31	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	33	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	0	0	29	29	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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

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	87	90	94	98	107	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	15	21	28	22	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	25	31	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	33	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	0	0	29	29	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	53%	56%				55%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						61%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						69%	56%	53%
Math Achievement	46%	43%	50%				71%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	44%						79%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						63%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	54%	59%				64%	58%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	79%	67%	12%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	74%	64%	10%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	64%	53%	11%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	47	50	30	48	38	20				
ELL	19	49	41	19	37	28	5				
BLK	31	67		33	55		42				
HSP	33	52	36	30	38	23	24				
MUL	67			77							
WHT	59	61		60	45		39				
FRL	39	55	44	39	44	31	31				

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	12	17	10	20	17		27				
ELL	25	48	20	18	30	10	32				
BLK	27			31							
HSP	38	56	27	30	36	14	35				
WHT	57	61		60	50		73				
FRL	42	53	27	37	43	13	48				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Overall marked decline from 2019 to 2022. However, slight increase in 2022 compared to 2021. Greatest gains 21-22 were in ELA learning gains by the lowest quartile increasing from 37 to 45 and math learning gains by the lowest quartile increasing from 15 to 31. The most significant decline is in science proficiency which went from 64 in 2109 to 50 in 2021 to 33 in 2022.

Our students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and Hispanic subgroups all fall below 41%. Black students are also below their peers at 46.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Greatest areas of need are science proficiency, math learning gains, and ELA proficiency.

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

Contributing factors include residual effects from the global pandemic, poor student attendance due to illness and quarantines, as well as teacher fatigue and significant skill gaps for students.

Overcoming these barriers requires setting a newly defined expectation that school is important and attendance is required. It also requires empowering teachers with a growth mindset and specific skillset to have a collective desire to achieve better outcomes for students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. Followed by math learning gains.

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

The school was focused on honing the MTSS process and designing quality interventions that were well monitored and implemented with fidelity.

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

While focusing on interventions can be a short term solution, strengthening the core is required for long term sustainable success.

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.

We have already launched and scheduled an ongoing series of PD presented by our district Title One department focused on best practices to support English Language Learners that will span the entire school year.

We will participate in RAISE conferences and PD sessions presented by the FLDOE focused on raising the level of literacy instruction for all students.

Our district math department will lead work focused on integrating math manipulatives and working through the predictable concrete, representational, and abstract phases of mathematical understanding and application.

We also have a school-wide focus on science and the enduring understandings that are critical at each grade level.

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

We have reimagined the roles of our school leadership team. Each role has very specific and targeted responsibilities with action steps and measurable outcomes. The plan has intentional opportunities for collaboration and support amongst the team as well. Our goal is systemic excellence so that we create highly efficient systems that are sustainable and yield success for our students and our school.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Math proficiency is below 50% in all three grade levels (3-5). An even smaller percentage of students made learning gains in math. These levels indicate that student engagement is a missing piece of our instructional practice.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal is to increase math proficiency by 2 percentage points from 46 to 48. Our goal is to increase math learning gains 2 percentage points from 44 to 46.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Student engagement will be monitored through lesson plans, Collaborative Learning Teams, classroom walkthroughs, specific feedback, evaluation cycle conferences, and student achievement progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	One of our Instructional Coaches is explicitly focused on student engagement strategies. She will provide professional development and coaching cycle support specific to research based best practices proven to significantly enhance student learning and achievement outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Such low proficiency levels indicate the need to provide teachers ongoing support with student engagement strategies as well as push towards the next steps of focusing on student agency, goal setting, and accountability.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide ongoing job-embedded professional development and coaching cycle support focused on engagement strategies, student agency, goal setting, and accountability.

Person Responsible	Emily Sinclair (sinclae@martin.k12.fl.us)

In collaboration with teachers, develop a monthly engagement strategy focus calendar to showcase different types and purposes of the structures. Empower teachers and students to make videos highlighting the highly engaging structures used in their classrooms.

Person Responsible	Emily Sinclair (sinclae@martin.k12.fl.us)

Focus work in CLTs on incorporating engagement strategies into content area lessons. Specifically focus on pre-planning math manipulatives to be included in math whole group and small group lessons to support students through the concrete, representational, and abstract stages of mathematical understanding and application.

Person Responsible	Jessica Sercia (serciaj@martinschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Science proficiency is 33%. This low level of proficiency indicates the need for clarity around critical content of the standards at every grade level.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal is to increase science proficiency from 33 to 35%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Standards-based science instruction will be monitored through dally lesson plans with explicit learning targets, pre-planned monitoring questions, and hands-on application activities. Science instruction will also be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, progress monitoring assessments, and CLTs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Identifying critical content and explicitly communicating learning targets repeatedly and consistently throughout every lesson is a research based strategy proven to increase teacher competency and student achievement. Focus on Backward Design and intentional planning will also empower teachers to design lessons that result in student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Backward design and intentional planning combined with the four guiding questions of the CLT process are integral to supporting the work of standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We designed the role of our science coach to be a hybrid model of direct student support and science coaching. We designated specific times for science instruction at every grade level on the master schedule. School administrators have set a clear school-wide focus on science. Our science coach is empowered to support teachers and students with clarity around critical content.

Person Responsible   Nancy Bentz (bentzn@martin.k12.fl.us)

School administrators set a school-wide expectation that all classes work through the scientific process by completing a class science project during the first semester. Our science coach will meet with CLTs to provide heavy scaffolding and support with manageable timelines. Additionally, all students in grades 3-5 will conduct individual science projects during the second semester. Our science coach will provide

support, materials, and manageable timelines as well as host afternoon and evening science project sessions for students and families.

Person Responsible   Nancy Bentz (bentzn@martin.k12.fl.us)

We will implement a science word of the week that is advertised in morning announcements, commercials on the school news, posters around campus, parent newsletters, and integrated into Related Arts classes and grade level classrooms each week. We will also host two Family Science Nights to bolster enthusiasm and excitement about science as well as increase family engagement.

Person Responsible   Nancy Bentz (bentzn@martin.k12.fl.us)

We designed our related arts rotation to allow grades 4-5 more time in the science lab each week. Our science coach will also hos in-school science lab "field trips" for K-2 classes to gain more hands-on experience with the application of science concepts.

Person Responsible   Nancy Bentz (bentzn@martin.k12.fl.us)

We designed our related arts rotation to allow grades 4-5 more time in the science lab each week. Our science coach will also hos in-school science lab "field trips" for K-2 classes to gain more hands-on experience with the application of science concepts.

Person Responsible   Nancy Bentz (bentzn@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Student proficiency levels and learning gains have significantly decreased since 2019. This indicates a need to reimagine school systems and specific roles and responsibilities of the school leadership team.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal is to increase ELA proficiency from 46 to 48. Our goal is to increase ELA learning gains from 58 to 61.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This will be monitored through weekly Leadership Team meeting agendas which are transparently shared with the entire school, work calendars, classroom visits, engagement surveys, and student achievement data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Collective efficacy is a research based factor with a significant effect size. Having clearly defined roles, responsibilities and intentionally planned opportunities for collaboration is also proven to foster school improvement. Clarity around the school's vision, mission, and action plan empowers each member of the leadership team to hold the vision, trust the process, and stay the course.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students achievement data indicates that we have to do things differently. We must evaluate the resources we have and intentionally plan to use them more effectively and efficiently. The criteria of effective schools, research based stages of teaming, and visible learning strategies are all included in the roes of our leadership team.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Each member of the leadership team has a clearly defined role explicitly linked to one of our school improvement goals. Each member has action steps with strategies, coaching support, and opportunities for collaboration and autonomy. We have weekly leadership team meetings with timed agendas that are shared in advance. Individual meetings are scheduled for personal check-ins, progress monitoring, and goal setting.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development focused on leadership skills and instructional coaching is embedded in our weekly leadership meetings and also supplemented by district level coaches. This multi-layered support

allows the work to continue to move forward on all fronts. We focus on systemic excellence and fluidly move through the continuous improvement cycle.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our ELL subgroup is at 32% proficiency in ELA. This low proficiency level shows the need to target this area and improve instructional practices and support for our ELL students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal is to increase ELL proficiency in ELA from 32 to 34.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitored through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, progress monitoring assessments, ELL para schedules, and Can-Do Descriptors rubric.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dayna Carroll (carrold@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Research based language acquisition strategies and stages of development as well as ELL accommodations and universal design for learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Such low proficiency levels indicate the need for a school-wide focus on ELL best practices and ongoing professional development for teachers and staff.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

In collaboration with the district Title One department, our instructional coach will facilitate ongoing professional development throughout the school year focused on ELL best practices, universal design for learning, and progress monitoring with the Can-Do Descriptor rubric.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Ressler (ressles@martin.k12.fl.us)

We will implement a Newcomer's Club for Non-English speakers new to our school and/or new to the country. Our instructional coach with support of our ELL paras and parent liaison, used data to strategically identify student mentors to partner with student newcomers. Mentors were trained and are now supporting students at their weekly Newcomer sessions.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Ressler (ressles@martin.k12.fl.us)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our Hispanic subgroup ELA proficiency is 37%. This low level of reading and writing proficiency reveals the need to focus on supporting our Hispanic students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal is to increase ELA proficiency of our Hispanic students from 37 to 39%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitored through lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, progress monitoring data, and assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dayna Carroll (carrold@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We have a renewed focus on studying implicit bias and cultural sensitivity. We've also employed several bilingual staff members who help translate and communicate with our Hispanic families.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	We want all students to be successful and to eliminate the achievement gap between our Hispanic students and their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will plan and host our first ever Family Heritage Night in an effort to involve Hispanic families in our school. This event will allow families from many different backgrounds to showcase their native countries and share with others.

Person Responsible	Emily Sinclair (sinclae@martin.k12.fl.us)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our students with disabilities are 39% ELA proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal is to increase students with disabilities ELA proficiency from 39 to 42%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitored through lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, Support Facilitation Logs, progress monitoring data, IEP goals, and assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will put supports in place through universal design for learning and continue to focus on intentional planning and backwards design. We will focus on critical content and pre-teaching skills and concepts to our lowest quartile so they are more ready to be successful when the new information is presented to the whole class.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The low level of proficiency of our students with disabilities warrants action to be taken to more effectively meet their needs and scaffold instruction so that all students are learning, growing, and meeting grade level expectations.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Our IPS coach will facilitate monthly professional development sessions for our ESE paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible | Christine Durst (durstc@martinschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

2021-2022 data showed that 55% of our K-2 students were on track to be proficient readers and writers on the Spring Benchmark Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

46% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient readers and writers.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our goal is for 60% of our K-2 students to be proficient readers and writers.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our goal is for 50% of our 3-5 students to be proficient readers and writers.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

ELA instruction will be monitored through lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, Instructional Rigor Walks, progress monitoring data, and assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Michels, Jennifer, michelj@martin.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We use Benchmark Advanced as our core ELA curriculum. It is tightly aligned to the BEST standards. We hold tight to the MTSS process and fluidly move students through targeted interventions. We have a school-wide focus on writing and embedding writing standards and strategies into daily ELA instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Resources were selected through the textbook adoption process facilitated by our school district. We have additional supplemental resources to focus on phonics and opportunities for application in text.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Our Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly and focuses on literacy instruction, best practices, and student outcomes.	Michels, Jennifer, michelj@martin.k12.fl.us
Our Literacy Leadership Team has a renewed focus and energized spirit. We meet monthly to share observations, reflections, best practices, and analyze student outcomes. Our instructional coaches are focused on early intervention and closing gaps for all students. We empower teachers to visit other classrooms to glean instructional strategies and to share students based on student performance data and teacher outcomes and skill sets.	Michels, Jennifer, michelj@martin.k12.fl.us
We are committed to Professional Learning focused on the science of reading. We facilitated a summer book study. Our Literacy Leadership Team participates in PD sessions provided by the FLDOE and brings that information back to share with all teachers.	Ressler, Stephanie, ressles@martin.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

SeaWind Elementary has adopted the school theme this year of "Fins Family...One Team, One Dream!" This illustrates our commitment to fostering school spirit, pride, and unity. We explicitly focus on life and leadership skills so that our students can be successful and competitive in school and beyond. We nurture our school family by engaging in shared experiences that celebrate student success and growth. We focus on making learning fun, memorable, and meaningful for all students. We have a culture of collaboration and collective efficacy that empowers teachers and staff to work creatively to meet the needs of diverse learners.

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

We involve students, staff, parents, community members, and volunteers in school celebrations and events. We transparently share our school goals with all stakeholders so that everyone can hold the vision and trust the process. We integrate our focus words of teamwork, urgency, and importance into daily activities. Our PTA and SAC proactively work to support school improvement. We provide extracurricular opportunities for students to hone their skills outside the classroom and involve families and community members in many of these opportunities.