

Hamilton County School District

Hamilton County Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Hamilton County Elementary School

5686 US HIGHWAY 129 S, Jasper, FL 32052

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Peggy Hasty

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-6 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | <p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p> |
| School Grades History | <p>2018-19: C (46%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (47%)</p> <p>2016-17: D (39%)</p> <p>2015-16: D (40%)</p> |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Jeff Sewell |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hamilton 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

At Hamilton County Elementary School we believe that all students can and will learn. To achieve this mission, we will provide a quality education and empower students with the tools necessary to learn. Achieving our mission will increase student academic achievement and create lifelong learners. The Hamilton County School district mission is to ensure a successful future for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement

At Hamilton County Elementary School, our vision is creating a learning environment where all students can excel academically, focus on positive behavior, and foster social and emotional development. Student engagement is an essential part of the learning process.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Hasty, Peggy | Principal | |
| Griffin, Kathy | Assistant Principal | |
| Combass, Dawn | Teacher, PreK | |
| Combass, Leeann | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Norris, Leighann | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Byrd, Michelana | Instructional Media | |
| Land, Regina | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Peggy Hasty

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-6 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (40%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Jeff Sewell |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 99 | 110 | 108 | 99 | 126 | 105 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 766 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 23 | 29 | 28 | 15 | 20 | 19 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 13 | 16 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 11 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 38 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 17 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/22/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 113 | 118 | 117 | 149 | 113 | 118 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 835 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 113 | 118 | 117 | 149 | 113 | 118 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 835 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 40% | 0% | 57% | 33% | 0% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 50% | 0% | 58% | 49% | 0% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 56% | 0% | 53% | 48% | 0% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 47% | 0% | 63% | 50% | 0% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 47% | 0% | 62% | 59% | 0% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 0% | 51% | 54% | 0% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 41% | 0% | 53% | 34% | 0% | 55% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 58% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 36% | 0% | 57% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 34% | 34% | 0% | 58% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 43% | 43% | 0% | 56% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 43% | 43% | 0% | 56% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 23% | 0% | 55% | -32% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 20% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 34% | 33% | 1% | 54% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 29% | 30% | -1% | 52% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 57% | 57% | 0% | 62% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 61% | 1% | 62% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 45% | 44% | 1% | 64% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 62% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -17% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 60% | -10% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 36% | 0% | 61% | -25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 39% | 39% | 0% | 55% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 49% | 1% | 52% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 39% | 1% | 53% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 33% | 0% | 55% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 13 | 32 | 33 | 19 | 39 | 34 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 45 | 67 | 47 | 42 | 50 | 40 | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 50 | 51 | 36 | 46 | 47 | 22 | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 47 | 65 | 50 | 47 | 50 | 47 | | | | |
| MUL | 55 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 54 | 60 | 60 | 48 | 27 | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 50 | 58 | 43 | 44 | 43 | 27 | | | | |

| 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 13 | 38 | 36 | 29 | 47 | 34 | 22 | | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 46 | 57 | 58 | 54 | 60 | 20 | | | | |

| 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| BLK | 19 | 41 | 41 | 36 | 52 | 45 | 16 | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | 48 | 65 | 58 | 62 | 62 | 34 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 64 | | 50 | 58 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 57 | 48 | 60 | 64 | 69 | 54 | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 47 | 49 | 45 | 56 | 52 | 32 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 52 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 377 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 26 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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 | 40 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 49 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 46 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

According to the data, the 4th grade ELA showed the lowest performance. The contributing factors for this decline were the lack of rigorous instruction across the grade level, and the inconsistency in immediate intensive instruction.

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

According to the data, the 4th grade ELA from the previous year had a decline of 9%. The contributing factor is the need for targeted intensive intervention and the overall quality of instruction in ELA which also includes evidence based writing.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

The 4th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The 4th grade ELA performance fell 24% below that of the state average. The factors that contributed to this gap were a need for rigorous, and more targeted instruction. Also, the need for monitoring and making appropriate adjustments to instruction.

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

The 5th grade ELA showed the most improvement from the previous year. The 5th grade ELA improved from 23% to 43%, which resulted in a 20% increase in performance. The grade level had an adjustment to the writing instruction by adding more quality and rigor by integrating ELA standards across content areas.

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

According to the data, Students with Disabilities and African American students fall under the minimum 41%.

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

1. There was a decline in performance in Math in all grade levels except one. Math instruction and student performance will be closely monitored.
2. The 4th grade ELA and Math decline in achievement. The 4th grade will receive support from the instructional leaders on school and district level. The ELA and Math will instruction will be monitored and teachers will receive feedback and support as often as needed.
3. The bottom quartile students remain a priority. These students are generally significantly below grade level expectations and need the most intensive support. We will continue to provide intervention and support.
4. After reviewing subgroup data, it is evident that Students with Disabilities and African American students are below the minimum 41%. We will continue to monitor student demographics and subgroups to identify the students who are at risk, and provide the necessary supports to improve overall performance.
5. The quality of instruction is a high priority. We will continue to offer targeted professional development in order to improve the instructional delivery by the teachers. We will also work to improve lesson planning and preparation, as well as adding rigor by using the appropriate DOK, and emphasizing higher order thinking strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | According to the 18-19 Math FSA data, Math had a decline in all grades except fifth grade. There was no FSA data for 19-20 to compare. The baseline iReady data for the 2020-2021 school year indicated a decline in Math performance as well. The area of focus will be Math instruction, math progress monitoring, and math interventions. |
| Measureable Outcome: | Monthly data meeting will be held by administration with teachers to progress monitor. Observations of math instruction will be conducted frequently and feedback provided. Adjustments will be made based on Math data through the school year. Each grade level will use their intervention time evenly for math and reading. Past practice has been solely Reading interventions. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Peggy Hasty (peggy.hasty@hamiltonfl.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The evidence based strategy being implemented is adequate progress monitoring and ensuring standard based instruction of the standard is being taught to the rigor expected. STAR will be used to monitor progress every four weeks, standard based assessments at the completion of each standards taught, and iReady diagnostic every 12-13 weeks. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Although we do not want to assess students too frequent, a closer evaluation of student performance will be expected to ensure adequate time is allowed to adjust when needed. |

Action Steps to Implement

Mrs. Bennett will schedule and monitor the assessing of students. The administration will hold monthly data meetings to discuss the data. Supplemental materials will be provided as needed. Teachers will plan Math intervention time and adjust as student progress.

Person Responsible Peggy Hasty (peggy.hasty@hamiltonfl.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the 18-19 FSA data, students made gains in ELA, yet three of the grade levels were below the state average. There was no FSA data for the 19-20 school year to compare. The 20-21 baseline iReady data indicated a decline in ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: For the 20-21 school year, our goal is to have a minimum of 50% proficiency with our fifth and sixth grade with a minimum of 50% growth in learning gains and bottom quartile. We will progress monitor using benchmark data, STAR, and iReady data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Peggy Hasty (peggy.hasty@hamiltonfl.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tier I will have rigorous standard based instruction, tier II will have small group instruction, and tier III students will receive daily intensive intervention. Intervention teachers are supporting in reading instruction. Tutoring is being offered as well to extend the learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: More small group instruction and intensive intervention will be delivered to better indicate and address areas of deficit.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will meet monthly or more frequent as needed. The leadership team will discuss school wide data, establish a plan of action, and progress monitor student achievement.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Hamilton County Elementary School continues to build a positive school culture involving various stakeholders. The leadership team meets monthly and parent and community involvement is discussed. With the COVID situation in school year 20-21, the physical aspect of engagement is limited. Even with those restrictions, it is HCES goal to continue increasing communication, support, and resources to support building a positive culture at HCES.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |