
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Hawks Rise Elementary School

205 MEADOW RIDGE DR, Tallahassee, FL 32312

<https://www.leonschools.net/hawksrise>

Demographics

Principal: Beth Jackson

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	16%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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 Leon 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

Our mission at Hawks Rise Elementary School is to help each student develop into a lifelong learner who is inspired with productive creativity, equipped with the skills of a critical thinker, problem solver and decision maker, and prepared to be a responsible citizen. This will be accomplished through the cooperative efforts of the entire community (students, parents, school and partners) as we work together to provide a nurturing, safe, secure learning environment where respect for others is celebrated, and our students achieve success through their diverse and individual talents.

Provide the school's vision statement

Our vision at Hawks Rise is to guide students to realize their full potential.

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
Jackson, Beth	Principal	
Franklin, Amy	Teacher, ESE	
Van Hise, Meghann	Instructional Coach	
	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Beth Jackson

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	16%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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	105	117	128	152	135	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

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	127	125	154	130	149	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	822
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	14	8	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	127	125	154	130	149	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	822
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	14	8	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	87%	57%	57%	84%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	54%	58%	69%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	47%	53%	55%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	88%	64%	63%	84%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	76%	63%	62%	60%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	45%	51%	54%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	88%	52%	53%	83%	52%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	58%	28%
	2018	86%	61%	25%	57%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	57%	28%	58%	27%
	2018	87%	58%	29%	56%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	89%	56%	33%	56%	33%
	2018	82%	57%	25%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	92%	63%	29%	62%	30%
	2018	85%	64%	21%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	66%	18%	64%	20%
	2018	90%	62%	28%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	90%	61%	29%	60%	30%
	2018	80%	58%	22%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	89%	54%	35%	53%	36%
	2018	82%	56%	26%	55%	27%
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	50	51	32	53	47	35	38				
ELL	50	60		75	70						
ASN	88	73		98	83		95				
BLK	67	50	44	64	53	48	57				
HSP	91	85		77	77						
MUL	91	86		87	100						
WHT	89	73	67	90	76	68	90				
FRL	64	50	43	64	55	45	62				

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	42	45	33	39	36	24	45				
ASN	92	91		94	85		100				
BLK	52	53	41	52	35	40	59				
HSP	76	58		71	42						
MUL	88	50		83	71						
WHT	90	70	65	90	61	60	89				
FRL	51	51	39	48	35	32	41				

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)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	614
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	67
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	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	83
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	91
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	79
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	55
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

The lowest performing subgroup was the learning gains in students with disabilities. While we experienced some growth in the proficiency of this group, more growth is needed.

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

There was an increase in the percentile of all school grade components between the 2018 and 2019 FSA score. No state standardized test was administered during the spring of 2020.

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

Hawks Rise Elementary consistently scores above the state and district averages. The biggest gap occurs in the area in which the difference between school average and state average is the smallest. In 2019, Hawks Rise Elementary had 61% of the lowest 25th percentile of students achieve learning gains in math. The state average for this area was 51%.

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

Math learning gains was the school grade component with the most improvement. Hawks Rise Elementary had 76% of students achieve learning gains in math in 2019. 60% of students achieved math learning gains in 2018.

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

There are two potential areas of concern when reviewing the EWS data: attendance below 90% and scoring a level 1 on the statewide assessment.

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

1. increased math learning gains for students with disabilities
2. increased language arts learning gains for students with disabilities
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math learning gains for students with disabilities had a decline from 2017 state assessment scores to the 2018 scores. In 2019, the learning gains at Hawks Rise are still some of the lowest percentile rankings for the school with 60% of students having made learning gains in math.

Measureable Outcome: An increase in the learning gains for students with disabilities which will result in increased learning gains for our school. The goal for math learning gains at Hawks Rise is that 62% of students making learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Beth Jackson (jacksonb4@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities have historically been receiving grade level instruction for math and language arts in the resource room. For the 2018-2019 school year, students with disabilities were moved to an inclusion model for kindergarten, second grade, third grade, and math instruction in 4th and 5th grades. A teacher certified in special education or a paraprofessional was placed in the general education classroom to support instruction and skill practice for students. We saw an increase in math learning gains. As a result, this inclusion model has been expanded for the 2020-2021 school year to include language arts in addition to math instruction in kindergarten through 5th grade.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Inclusion for students with disabilities is an evidence based strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule student in inclusion courses
2. Provide professional development to support co-teaching
3. Provide planning time for co-teachers

Person Responsible Beth Jackson (jacksonb4@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increased reading comprehension benefits all students. One measure of reading comprehension is the FSA ELA. It is our goal to increase the FSA ELA proficiency percentile.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2019 FSA, 86% of 3rd grade students, 85% of 4th grade students, and 89% of 5th grade students scored a level 3 or higher. It is our goal for the 2021 FSA that 86% of 3rd grade students, 87% of 4th grade students, and 86% of 5th grade students score a level 3 or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Meghann Van Hise (vanhisem@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities have historically been receiving grade level instruction for math and language arts in the resource room. For the 2018-2019 school year, students with disabilities were moved to an inclusion model for kindergarten, second grade, third grade, and math instruction in 4th and 5th grades. A teacher certified in special education or a paraprofessional was placed in the general education classroom to support instruction and skill practice for students. We saw an increase in math learning gains. As a result, this inclusion model has been expanded for the 2020-2021 school year to include languages arts and math instruction. In addition, reading intervention groups will be arranged into decoding groups and comprehension groups for the school this year. We will be implementing the Read Naturally curriculum for the second time. Due to the state standardized test being cancelled, we do not have data on last year's implementation of the curriculum. Also, there is increased focus on writing skills and teachers are integrating writing into the instruction across content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Intervention groups will be monitored with fluency assessments and STAR regularly. Writing instruction is team created and observed routinely.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule ESE students into inclusion class rooms.
2. Provide teachers with professional development on Read Naturally and coteaching.
3. Regular progress monitoring will be used to ensure effectiveness.

Person Responsible Meghann Van Hise (vanhisem@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Regular check ins with teachers and progress monitoring meetings will support any remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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.

During this pandemic, Hawks Rise misses the parental involvement that occurs with volunteers on campus.

To promote a positive school culture in the midst of COVID- 19, the following steps will be implemented:

- Soliciting feedback from parents regarding their comfort level in contacting teachers and administrators with questions or problems.
- During Open House, curriculum night, etc. ensure non-threatening methods of introducing parents to teachers and administrators.
- Communicate classroom and school news to parents.
- Offer Professional Development concerning effective strategies for conducting supportive and effective parent phone calls and face-to-face meetings.
- Create the formats for inviting parent participation in the cultural education process.
- Positive notes, letters, phone calls home.
- Beginning of the Year academic and behavioral expectations are clearly taught by teachers.

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