

Okeechobee County School District

North Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

North Elementary School

3000 NW 10TH TER, Okeechobee, FL 34972

<http://northelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Tuuli Robinson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

North Elementary School

3000 NW 10TH TER, Okeechobee, FL 34972

<http://northelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">93%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

North Elementary School will create a learning environment in which teachers and parents work together to enable each student to realize his/her potential. The school and its faculty will provide students with the best resources and instruction possible in order for them to be successful both in school, and later in life as thriving members of our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Achieving excellence - putting students first!

Compassion and Grace

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
Shirley, Alyson	Assistant Principal	School leadership - all levels
Robinson, Tuuli	Principal	Instructional leadership
Smith, Colleen	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach and related assignments
Striebel, Myranda	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach and related duties
Cook, Katrina	School Counselor	Guidance
Kirton, Samantha	Other	Resource specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Tuuli Robinson

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	82	88	84	95	87	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

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	11	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	105	110	111	103	103	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	647
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	14	6	14	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	12	10	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	105	110	111	103	103	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	647
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	14	6	14	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	12	10	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	65%	52%	57%	57%	47%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	54%	58%	53%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	55%	53%	59%	57%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	62%	63%	64%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	62%	45%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	42%	51%	38%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	44%	53%	47%	42%	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	77%	59%	18%	58%	19%
	2018	69%	53%	16%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	46%	4%	58%	-8%
	2018	51%	41%	10%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	61%	50%	11%	56%	5%
	2018	50%	44%	6%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	66%	4%	62%	8%
	2018	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	60%	13%	64%	9%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	57%	56%	1%	60%	-3%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	44%	2%	53%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	52%	4%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	47	44	56	49	48	33	25				
ELL	49	43	57	67	69	56	28				
BLK	47	61		42	61						
HSP	54	47	54	66	69	54	34				
WHT	76	62	60	77	70	60	65				
FRL	56	54	63	63	60	47	39				
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	47	41	36	45	27	19	42				
ELL	50	42	32	57	36	24	65				
BLK	62	33		52	15						
HSP	50	43	36	56	41	25	63				
WHT	66	46	31	72	44	22	61				
FRL	54	42	33	60	37	24	54				
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	32	47	62	46	45	47	33				
ELL	43	55	69	61	52	43	28				
BLK	57			67	60						
HSP	45	50	58	61	53	41	33				
WHT	66	54	58	66	36	30	60				
FRL	50	51	59	60	42	39	38				

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
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	54
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	53
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	55
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	67
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 following data components indicate the lowest performance overall:
 5th grade Science achievement (49%; 4% below state)
 ELA Learning Gains (56%; 2% below state)

By grade level, the following data components indicate the lowest performance:
 5th grade Science (49%; 13% decline from 2018; no scores in 2020)
 4th grade ELA (50%; 1% decline from 2018; no scores in 2020)

No subgroups in 2018 identified by ESSA Federal Index that performed below 41%.

Even though some areas of performance were lower than others, to the most part, NES outperformed the district as well as the state with the exception of 4th grade ELA learning gains and 5th grade Science achievement where we outperformed the district, but underperformed when compared to the state.

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

The only reported areas that showed decline from 2018 were 5th grade Science and 4th grade ELA learning gains.

it is difficult to make any inferences from the drop in the Science achievement as a large group of students was not included in the 2017 science achievement calculations due to a testing error.

We did not anticipate the drop in 4th grade ELA scores based on diagnostic assessments, standards assessments, and student grades; students were outperforming the like schools in the district, and demonstrated anticipated gains as outlined by the iReady FSA crosswalk.

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 gap analysis with the state indicates that NES underperformed in the following areas on the last state assessment (2018-19):

4th grade ELA (gap -8%)

5th grade Math (gap -3%)

5th grade science (gap -7%).

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

Our performance improved the most in the following areas in 2018:

ELA achievement, ELA overall learning gains, and ELA learning gains in the BQ

Math achievement, Math learning gains, and Math learning gains in the BQ

We believe that stability in staffing had a positive impact on improved student achievement scores. Teachers were more comfortable with the content which also allowed them engage in meaningful discourse related to the content.

Additionally, we used a new method in tracking student data. Students had individual data sheets in their AVID binders, and each teacher had individual students performance cards in Reading Coaches room that we used during PLCs to track students' learning after diagnostic assessments. A new writing curriculum in ELA (Top Score Writing) has helped us to produce more solid writing scores even though we are still lacking in top writing performance. We used ReadyGEN materials in ELA which introduced a more complex text and higher level questions that can also positively impact student learning.

We also implemented targeted after school tutoring for students in the BQ.

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

Even though these is no baseline data from 2019-2020, we continue to be cautious and cognizant about making learning gains in both ELA and Math.

We did not have any areas of concern based on the ESSA data (all subgroups performed above 41%).

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

1. Raise ELA achievement scores in 4th and 5th grade.
2. Raise math achievement scores in 4th and 5th grade.

3. Raise overall science achievement in 5th grade.
4. Maintain traditional proficiency in 3rd grade ELA and Math.5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With all new team members in 5th grade math and science, it can be expected that it will take some time for the teachers to become familiar with the curriculum as well as the instructional standards. In math, we have a district roadmap to follow. With no district level science roadmap however, instructional standards and assessment blueprints will be our focal point in planning and delivering instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	NES demonstrated a 49% proficiency compared to 53% state level proficiency on 2018 FCAT which is also a 12% drop compared to 2017. Goal for 2020-21: Meet the state proficiency in Science in 2020 (a gain of 4%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Myranda Striebel (myranda.striebe1@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evaluate lesson plans for incorporating science standards; Observe lessons and ensure that standards based, high quality learning materials are used to deliver instruction; Provide feedback through coaching cycle on improving instructional practice as needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

New teacher support, ongoing instructional support through coaching cycles; professional PLCs in math and Science

Person Responsible Myranda Striebel (myranda.striebe1@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning gains in ELA was one of our focus areas in 2019-20, based on the needs assessment and analysis of the 2018-19 state assessment data. With reading being a fundamentally important skill, we will continue to strive at making learning gains in our students' achievement in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: Meet or exceed state learning gains in ELA (gap of -8% in 2018-19).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Colleen Smith (colleen.smith@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use of standards based materials in ELA;
Instructional support and coaching through coaching cycles;
Student engagement (time on task);
Promote the love of reading to enhance vocabulary acquisition and broaden students' content area knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: It is our hope that by exposing students to standards based instructional materials, providing engaging lessons that increase students' active time on task, and providing instructional support through coaching cycles will help us maintain a strong instructional focus, leading to an improved learning outcome.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing instructional support through ELA Professional Learning Community, led by the Reading Coach.

Person Responsible Colleen Smith (colleen.smith@okee.k12.fl.us)

Ensure high expectations and use of district approved instructional materials; provide supports as needed.

Person Responsible Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)

Use frequent progress monitoring and ensure that support systems are in place through MTSS.

Person Responsible Alyson Shirley (alyson.shirley@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to Students' and Staff Mental Health and Wellbeing

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: With the lasting effects of nation-wide epidemic, it is important that we find a healthy balance at schools between rigorous and standards based instruction, and grace and compassion when we teach student populations who are affected by the pandemic both mentally as well as physically. If students' and staff mental health and well-being are not addressed, we cannot function at a full instructional capacity.

Measurable Outcome: While it is difficult to measure students' mental health and wellbeing, we are striving at creating a positive school climate that includes a healthy balance of instructional activities and other extracurricular activities and highlights such as themed weeks, PBIS initiatives, incentives for all types of learning (KG Smarties, AR Star Readers, Reflex Math Super Users, to name a few). Bi-weekly on site staff support meetings are held with the guidance of the Director of Mental Health.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students' mental health and wellbeing are an important cornerstone and foundation for a healthy school environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A balance is needed in our students' lives at this time to help them cope with the effects of the national pandemic, caused by COVID-19.

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 support the schoolwide improvement priorities by focusing on the Goal 1 of the District Strategic Plan of 2020-2025:

Align curriculum materials with standards to support effective delivery of instruction, so students can gain knowledge and master grade level content and standards (assessment).

Action steps as outlined in the District Plan include the following priorities:

CURRICULUM

1a. Implement district wide curriculum and maps covering the new standards, with fidelity.

INSTRUCTION

1b. Continue to define our vision of effective instruction; Conduct classroom walk throughs and instructional observations to monitor staff implementation of effective instruction.

1c. Strengthen the MTSS process; utilize Branching Minds platform for tracking and monitoring interventions.

1d. Ensure scheduled, high-quality PLCs as outlined in the Reading/Math Coaches' schedule

ASSESSMENT

1e. Utilize common assessments; analyze assessment data and plan for next steps.

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.

NES continues to seek opportunities to enhance relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school mission and support the needs of students. Open House is an annual activity where students and families are invited on campus to meet their child's teachers, administration, and many of the support staff that are in direct contact with students. While held virtually this year, our Open House aimed at similar goals as face to face meetings: disseminating important information and creating an avenue for communication with families.

In addition to Open House, parent nights are held throughout the year and focus around a school related topic, student activity, and/or content area. For time being, these meetings are held virtually.

Revamped Academic Parent Teacher Team (APTT) meetings are held three times per year. At these meetings, student data is shared on foundational reading and math skills. Parents are able to see where

their child is performing compared to other students in class. Teachers then teach an activity and provide materials for parents utilize at home with their child. These activities will enhance instruction and enrich skills needed to be successful in reading and math.

Additionally, NES will include parents in school business by inviting all parents to attend school events and participate in school committees. Parental input is gathered via surveys to ensure that the needs of parents are met.

Parent Teacher Organization meets when possible to brainstorm fundraising opportunities.

SAC meetings are held five times a year to inform stakeholders (principal, teachers, classified staff, parents, and community members) of school business.

Stakeholders are notified of school business via Weekly Parent Memos that are disseminated via e-mail, Facebook, and school website.

Community members who support our school are recognized on social media, and more formally, at our School Board meetings.

The local newspaper is used to advertise the successes within the school.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Students' and Staff Mental Health and Wellbeing	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00