Navy Point Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Navy Point Elementary School

1321 PATTON DR, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Monica Ford Harris C

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-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Escambia 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

Navy Point Elementary School

1321 PATTON DR, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

All members of the school community work together to motivate students to develop into successful learners, good citizens, and future leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Create a school where parents want to send their children, students want to learn, teachers want to teach and employees want to work.

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
Ford-Harris, Monica	Principal	Facilitate the leadership team meetings. Work to establish the weekly agenda items for discussion. Ensure that the identified plan for support is carried out to fidelity. Monitor the school's progress towards meeting the SIP goals, manage any needed course corrections.
Rudd, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Support the principal to ensure that the identified plan for support is carried out to fidelity. Assist with monitoring the school's progress towards meeting the SIP goals, managing any needed course corrections.
White, Kanisha	Instructional Coach	Work to support through side by side coaching and/or modeling of lessons. Assist teachers with lesson planning as needed. Provide constructive feedback to teachers through a coach's lens.
Garner, Latris	Instructional Coach	Facilitate and support teachers with the RtI/MTSS process. Lead whole group and small group PD opportunities on the appropriate paperwork. Provide teachers resources for progress monitoring and data collection.
Gooden, Bernita	School Counselor	Assist with facilitating and supporting teachers with the RtI/MTSS process. Help to lead whole group and small group PD opportunities on the appropriate paperwork. Assist with providing teachers resources for progress monitoring and data collection. Lead targeted small groups of students on social needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Monica Ford Harris C

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
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	38	83	69	57	71	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	13	28	22	17	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	4	7	3	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	6	2	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	14	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

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	73	94	57	72	76	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	441
Attendance below 90 percent	11	12	10	11	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	4	2	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	27	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	1	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	14	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	73	94	57	72	76	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	441
Attendance below 90 percent	11	12	10	11	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	4	2	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	27	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	1	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	14	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	42%	53%	57%	28%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	55%	58%	40%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	52%	53%	44%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	57%	63%	32%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	60%	62%	29%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	51%	30%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	54%	53%	59%	50%	51%

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	46%	56%	-10%	58%	-12%
	2018	36%	52%	-16%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
	2018	23%	51%	-28%	56%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	27%	51%	-24%	56%	-29%
	2018	21%	44%	-23%	55%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	51%	55%	-4%	62%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	41%	54%	-13%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	58%	-23%	64%	-29%
	2018	20%	58%	-38%	62%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	26%	55%	-29%	60%	-34%
	2018	21%	52%	-31%	61%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	55%	-23%	53%	-21%
	2018	34%	55%	-21%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	35	32		33	55	50	46				
ELL	43	50		26	57		18				
BLK	31	49	50	30	40	41	32				
HSP	55	60		43	68		39				
WHT	44	53		51	65		41				
FRL	40	49	54	37	51	50	40				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	33	43	31	29	32	13	33				
ELL	35	50		20	29						
BLK	22	26	23	24	31	28	36				
HSP	30	43	50	28	29		38				
MUL	21	10		36	40						
WHT	39	36		39	38		53				
FRL	24	31	43	29	35	24	33				

2017 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	6	25		6	30	31					
ELL	27	40		27	40						
BLK	19	42	56	27	26	40	37				
HSP	32	40		36	30						
MUL	19	17		13	8						
WHT	36	48		38	36		63				
FRL	26	41	39	28	27	24	54				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	39
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	54
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	51
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	46
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 2020 Florida Standards Assessment was not administered due to COVID-19. However, based on our 2018-2019 data, science was the lowest achievement area. Our school's overall percentage in science declined from 38% to 39% in 2019. Some of the contributing factors included teacher turnover rate due to VAM scores, teacher certification, pacing of instruction, and limited hands on activities to support learning connections.

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

Science again was the area of decline based on our 2019 school data. The percentage proficient declined from 39% (2018) to 38% (2019). Some of the contributing factors included teacher turnover rate due to VAM scores, teacher certification, pacing of instruction, and limited hands on activities to support learning connections.

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.

Based on our 2019 Florida Standards Assessment data, math demonstrated the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Navy Point's percent proficient was 41% and the state average was 63%. This made for a 22% point difference. Some of the contributing factors to this significant difference include insufficient practice of gridded response items, teacher misconception of small group instruction, and teacher turnover due to VAM and certification issues.

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

Based on the 2019 Florida State Assessment results, our math learning gain for the lowest 25% showed the most improvement. The percent proficient moved from 26% in 2018 to 56% in 2019, making it a 30 percentage point improvement. The contributing factors include tutoring services during and after school for identified students. integration of literacy in math through the classroom libraries, as well as targeted use of i-Ready for remediation.

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

Our two areas of concern based on the EWS data are attendance and the number of students with 1 or more suspensions. We know that the more students miss school, the more likely they are to score a level 1 on the Florida Standards Assessment. Well, if students are suspended they are ultimately missing school/instruction. If we implement a solid and effective school-wide behavior support system, we will help to reduce the number of suspensions and absences.

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

1. Behavior Training and Support
2. Science Achievement
3. ESSA Index (Black/African American subgroup)
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Navy Point Elementary did not complete the 2020 Florida Standards Assessment due to COVID-19. However, after reviewing the 2018 FCAT 2.0 science data compared to 2019, there was a decline of one percentage point 39% to 38%. Based on our school's data science was the only cell in which we demonstrated a decline based on the 2019 data. The 5th grade science teacher has knowledge of the standards, pacing guide, and the FCAT 2.0 Assessment. She will be working closely with the Principal on planning and data disaggregation after each unit assessment. The students will be given a pre- and post assessment to measure their learning. The 5th grade teacher will also implement hands on labs at least once per week. Historically our students have struggled with the standards taught in the nature of science unit based on our FCAT 2.0 data. Facilitating weekly labs will help to build in a regular review of the skills/standards and tools learned in the nature of science unit. The implementation of weekly labs will also help the students make connections with content being learning in the current unit of study. We will continue to implement a science vocabulary focus school-wide. This will help to ensure that all students have exposure to many of the science terms prior to grade 5.
Measurable Outcome:	Navy Point's achievement goal for science is 45% or higher based on the 2020 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Navy Point will be using Study Island to supplement the classroom instruction. The lessons and assessments directly align to the FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment. We will continue to add science based readers into the classroom libraries. This will help support the literacy integration into the science block. We have also purchased the Toolkit from iReady. Most of the text found in the resources are social studies and science based. Thus, an additional tool for integration into the literacy block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Study Island's lessons/videos help reiterate the science standards. Specific lessons can be assigned for remediation purposes. The post-assessment can also serve as a re-assessment of standards missed on the unit assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly hands on labs

Person Responsible	Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfl.us)

Science vocabulary focus school-wide

Person Responsible	Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfl.us)

Bi-weekly review of unit assessment/Study Island data

Person Responsible	Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to COVID-19 Navy Point did not complete the 2020 Florida Standards Assessment. However, based on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment data and the ESSA Federal Index, our African-American subgroup was below the 41% threshold with 39% meeting the target.
Measurable Outcome:	Navy Point Elementary will work to monitor the African-American subgroup's performance after each STAR, iReady, and unit assessment for all content areas throughout the school year. Reviewing data on a regularly bases will allow us to course correct immediately to ensure we meet or exceed 41% based on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Navy Point will be using STAR, iReady, and Study Island to supplement the classroom instruction. Each of these tools will allow us to pull and analyze the African-American subgroup's data on a weekly or bi-weekly bases to progress monitor. The unit assessments in Schoolnet generate reports that contain specific data regarding all subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our school-wide behavior is another focus priority. The number of office discipline referrals and out of school suspensions. Our data reflects a disproportionate gap between our African American male students compared to all other subgroups in both of the areas listed above.

We will be implementing a new "House" plan to help encourage team work among the students and teachers. Each grade level team will represent one "House." The plan will encourage each member to hold one another accountable to help their "House" earn points. The top 3 Houses at the end of each quarter will be rewarded with a recognition of choice. The goal is to get all of our faculty and staff members involved positively and to have each grade level focus on a specific character trait for the year. Each teacher is responsible for teaching the assigned character trait and encouraging their students to model the trait for others.

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.

Navy Point Elementary is a Positive Behavior Intervention Support school. We have a team that meets monthly to review behavior data and to discuss how we can improve the school experience for all students.

We will be implementing a new "House" plan to help encourage team work among the students and teachers. Each grade level team will represent one "House." The plan will encourage each member to hold one another accountable to help their "House" earn points. The top 3 Houses at the end of each quarter will be rewarded with a recognition of choice. The goal is to get all of our faculty and staff members involved positively and to have each grade level focus on a specific character trait for the year. Each teacher is responsible for teaching the assigned character trait and encouraging their students to model the trait for others. Faculty and staff members will also be recognized for their efforts to help us implement a positive school culture. The goal is to get all of our faculty and staff members involved positively and to have each grade level team focus on a specific character trait for the year. Each teacher is responsible for teaching the character trait and encouraging their students to model the trait.

During our School Advisory Council Meetings, we will be sharing the new "House" plan for feedback. One of the agenda items at each meeting will include a sharing of our behavior data and "House" points. Our RtI/MTSS Coordinator and Guidance Counselor will also survey students to gain feedback from them on how well the "House" plan and PBIS in general is working for Navy Point.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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