

Alachua County Public Schools

# C. W. Norton Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# C. W. Norton Elementary School

2200 NW 45TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/norton>

## Demographics

**Principal: Elena Mayo**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## C. W. Norton Elementary School

2200 NW 45TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/norton>

### 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	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

### 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.**

At Norton Elementary School, we are fostering a community of leaders. Our goal is to create a safe and positive school environment that enhances student learning through teaching and recognizing our four expectations:

Be Respectful  
Be Safe  
Be Responsible  
Be Cooperative

We celebrate the leader within us all!

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Learning is the Key at Norton Elementary. We strive for excellence by actively engaging all students, parents, staff members and the community in a safe, nurturing, positive learning environment.

### 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
Mayo, Elena	Principal	Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; sets school-wide goals; ensures the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI, conducts assessment of MTSS/RtI skills with school staff, ensures implementation of interventions, reviews documentation; ensures training is conducted annually and as needed for individual students; participates in Educational Planning evaluation; participates in grade level CIMS and other grade level meetings; facilitates leadership team meetings; helps develop school-wide behavior plan.
Adams, Tiffany	Dean	Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT/Dean): Oversees school-wide behavior plan; chair Positive Behavior Support team; implements individual behavior plans; monitors/inputs behavior data into database (RtI:B and district data base); assists teachers with the implementation of classroom behavior plans; oversees transportation (buses and car circle); meets weekly with the leadership team on matters of concern/decision making
Harris, Annie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Provides curriculum support and training for teachers; helps develop and implement interventions; provides assessment and data support; participates in Educational Planning Team meetings, as needed; serves as assessment coordinator; assists in providing behavior support and training for teachers; helps develop and implement behavioral interventions in conjunction with the BRT; does classroom walk- throughs and teacher evaluations; assists with formation of common grade level assessments and oversees data collection of assessment scores.
Vahtapour, Sydney	School Counselor	School Counselor: Provides training and support in the MTSS/RtI process annually and as needed; works with teachers through the problem solving cycle; facilitates leadership meetings related to MTSS/RtI; monitors scheduling of Educational Planning Team meetings; facilitates Educational Planning Team meetings; teaches students through classroom guidance lessons; is responsible for scheduling of ESE meetings and 504 meetings; provides classroom guidance lessons; works with the Principal and/or Assistant Principal on issues of behavior; acts as a parent contact for parents who have academic and/or social concerns related to their child.
Gleman, Melissa	Instructional Coach	FCIM Instructional Coach oversees the RtI/MTSS process by providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, insuring that RTI/MTSS is implemented according to district guidelines; oversees implementation and documentation of interventions.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Elena Mayo



**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.*

2

**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.*

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A

<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	61	85	79	105	89	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	504
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	1	5	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	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	3	4	2	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

### 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	95	117	113	90	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	616
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	11	11	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	6	12	10	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

#### 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	2	1	4	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

#### 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	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

#### 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	95	117	113	90	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	616
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	11	11	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	6	12	10	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

#### 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	2	1	4	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

#### 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	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

## 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	61%	59%	57%	61%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	57%	58%	58%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	49%	53%	43%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	60%	63%	67%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	61%	62%	60%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	49%	51%	43%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	57%	53%	60%	55%	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	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	55%	-2%	58%	-5%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	65%	55%	10%	56%	9%
	2018	48%	55%	-7%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	58%	2%	62%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	72%	60%	12%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	60%	3%	64%	-1%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	55%	57%	-2%	60%	-5%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	55%	6%	53%	8%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	55%	4%
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	11	28	33	17	24	29	10				
ASN	80			90							
BLK	40	50	39	35	53	44	27				
HSP	62	34		62	52		47				
MUL	68	59		71	68		73				
WHT	73	63	50	73	64		78				
FRL	47	44	44	47	56	50	50				
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	25	27	21	31	41	33	10				
ASN	62	60		85	91						
BLK	31	35	34	47	50	29	28				
HSP	81	82		81	59		70				
MUL	65	38		88	81						
WHT	68	54		80	77		83				
FRL	43	47	33	61	60	33	41				

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	10	42	42	27	38	36	28				
ASN	80	90		94	100						
BLK	33	44	39	40	51	44	28				
HSP	63	56		67	63						
MUL	72	47		72	68		62				
WHT	75	69	67	81	61		85				
FRL	47	53	47	52	48	42	42				

### 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	54
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	85
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	41
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	51
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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	48
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.**

Performance of students in the bottom quartile in both ELA and Math showed the lowest performance when compared to peers at the end of the 2019 school year. The mid year (2020) scores from AIMS show the students in bottom quartile continue to struggle (14% for both ELA and Math). The school focused on the bottom quartile during the 2019-20 school year. Title I teacher tutors provided intervention to students identified as being in the bottom quartile. Additionally, supplemental materials were purchased to target specific deficits in ELA. Teachers received training from the coach on how to effectively implement these materials. This continues to be an area of concern.

Due to COVID 19 and the absence of summative assessment, all students will be baseline tested at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year.

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

The greatest decline is in the area of overall math achievement. Prior to the 2019 school year the data for math achievement had been improving from 66% in 2016 to 67% in 2017 and then 72% in 2018. Gains made by all students also increased from 2016 to 2018. The gains for the bottom quartile however have been declining from 2016 to 2018. Based on the 2019 FSA scores, this was the main area of concern for the school. In 2019-20, when comparing AIMS, math achievement scores declined from 64% to 46%. A new math series was introduced during the 2019-20 school year which may have contributed to the decline. The organization of the series caused confusion for many students. There have been organizational and pacing adjustments made for the upcoming year.

Due to COVID 19 and the absence of summative assessment, all students will be baseline tested at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year.

**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.**

Since there is no state average to draw from, school and district averages were compared. Performance of the lowest quartile in math showed the greatest gap when compared with district average. This was an area of focus for our school during the 2019-20 school and will continue to be an area of focus for the 2020-21 school year. A new math series was introduced during the 2019-20 school year which may have contributed to the gap. The organization of the series caused confusion for many students. There have been organizational and pacing adjustments made for the upcoming year.

Due to COVID 19 and the absence of summative assessment, all students will be baseline tested at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year.

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

The most improvement was noted in ELA learning gains by students in the lowest 25th percentile. During the 2019-20 school we added another Title I intervention teacher to provide research based interventions in ELA to students in the lowest quartile.



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

When reflecting on the EWS data for the current year as compared to the previous year, there are fewer students with multiple warning indicators. Attendance below 90% is an area of concern. This year with the pandemic and increased restrictions, attendance may be more problematic. Another area of concern is course failure in ELA and Math. The number of students failing was reduced but is still significant particularly in the primary grades.

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

1. Increase gains of Lowest Quartile in ELA and Math
2. Increase gains of students with disabilities in ELA and Math.
3. Increase student achievement in ELA and Math for all subgroups
4. Reduce the number of out of school suspensions.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** The school will focus on decreasing the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. The students with disabilities sub-group performed below 41% in 2018-19. There is a gap between their achievement when compared with peers.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase gains of students with disabilities in ELA and Math by three percentage points annually or one percentage point over the highest of the last 3 years. Thirty-six percent of students with disabilities will demonstrate learning gains in ELA and thirty-four percent of students with learning disabilities will demonstrate learning gains in math. Additionally, the percentage of students with disabilities showing proficiency will increase by 3% in ELA and math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Provide core instruction and research based intervention to students with disabilities in the least restrictive setting in accordance with their individual IEP.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students need exposure to core curriculum and scaffolded interventions to bridge academic deficits.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. All IEPs will be reviewed at the beginning of the year to determine placement for students based on their LRE.
2. A BPIE committee will meet monthly to discuss progress of ESE students and needed additional supports.
3. Professional development will be provided to all teachers on UDL.
4. Professional development will be provided to teachers on aligning standards with instruction and tiered interventions.
5. IEPs goals will be written to reflect individual needs based on current data. Students will receive interventions to target IEP goals.
6. Students will receive instruction and intervention in accordance with their IEP.

**Person Responsible:** Annie Harris (harrisal@gm.sbac.edu)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Reducing the achievement gap in all curricular areas is an area of focus for Norton Elementary. A review of school data showed a decrease in the gap for Black students from 2017-18 to 2018-19 in the area of learning gains for ELA and math as well as achievement level for math. The gap narrowed in ELA from 2018-19 to 2019-20, using AIMS data. Continued focus will help to narrow the achievement gap for all subgroups.

**Measurable Outcome:** All subgroups will show a 3% increase in the number of students achieving grade level proficiency in ELA and math

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Provide standards based instruction to all students in whole and small groups as well as reteaching based on current data.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The school showed overall improvement in learning gains during the 2019-20 school year in both subgroups. The school focused on quality classroom instruction aligned with state standards and student data. The school also focused on providing extra support to students in tier two and tier three. Continued implementation will help with continuing to close the achievement gap.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. An action team met over the summer to plan for standards instruction and acceleration of curriculum due to lost instruction during COVID 19 shutdown.
2. Teachers will receive ongoing training on aligning core instruction to State Standards and student needs using data.
3. Teachers will receive training on tiered academic interventions.
4. Students will be identified by using multiple sources of data (e.g. DIBELS, ISIP, FSA, District Quarterly Assessments) as being in the lowest quartile.
5. Targeted students will receive interventions in small groups.
6. Administrators will conduct Walkthroughs and observations tied to instructional framework and best practices providing feedback to teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In an effort to reduce the number of out of school suspensions of African American Students the school will focus on classroom culture by implementing PBIS and incorporating the OLWEUS curriculum. Students need to be in class in order to receive instruction on state standards. Suspension removes students from the classroom and causes them to miss instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** Reduce the number of out of school suspensions annually by 15%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The school will continue with implementation of PBIS. The OLWEUS Bully Prevention will be incorporated into the the PBIS plan.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** When the PBIS program is implemented with fidelity, students' positive behavior increases (resulting in a decrease of negative behavior and an increase in time on task).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. PBIS committee met to revise the PBIS plan incorporating monthly focus skills and the OLWEUS Bullying Prevention curriculum over summer.
2. PBIS inservice was provided to teachers during pre-planning.
3. Faculty and staff will positively reward students through the use of Classroom Dojo points for their behavior and following the school-wide expectations. Students will be able to use their Classroom Dojo points in a variety of ways (events, special days, etc.).
4. Teachers will hold daily class meetings with students to provide tier 1 instruction in behavior and bully prevention.
5. The school counselors will provide monthly guidance lessons to all students.
6. Data will be monitored by the leadership team to ensure student success.
7. Faculty and staff will receive training on tiered behavior interventions.
8. Tiered behavior interventions will be provided for students unable to be successful on the school wide plan.

**Person Responsible** Tiffany Adams (adamstm@gm.sbac.edu)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** School data shows a need to focus on increasing gains for students in the Lowest Quartile. While the percentage of students in the Lowest Quartile showing gains increased from 2018 to 2019, the percent showing gains still remained below both state and district average. Increasing the gains of the Lowest Quartile will help to close the achievement gap for students with disabilities who are often included in the Lowest Quartile.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase gains of the Lowest Quartile in ELA and Math by three percentage points annually or one percentage point over the highest of the last 3 years. Forty-four percent of students in the bottom quartile will achieve learning gains in ELA and Math on FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students identified as being in the Lowest Quartile will receive targeted interventions in small group.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who lack prerequisite skills in reading and/or math need additional support through academic intervention.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers receive training on aligning core instruction to State Standards.
2. Teachers receive training on tiered academic interventions.
3. Students are identified by using multiple sources of data (e.g. DIBELS, ISIP, FSA, District Quarterly Assessments) as being in the lowest quartile.
4. Grade level teams will meet monthly to review data and monitor progress of all students.
4. Targeted students receive interventions in small groups.
5. Title I teacher tutors provide additional support to students.
6. Adjustments to interventions will be made throughout the year based on data.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Gleman (glemanma@gm.sbac.edu)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The student services team will work with the assistant principal to continue improving student attendance. Educational Planning Team Meetings will be held to address specific student concerns. Additionally, the school counselors will work with faculty and staff to improve school culture through the use of the OLWEUS Bully Prevention Curriculum, the Start with Hello program, and the Safer Smarter Kids program.**

**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.

The school strives to provide multiple ways for parents and community members to be engaged in the school community. The year begins by welcoming families to school through Meet Your Teacher and Open House. At both of these events parents visit their students classrooms, learning about their child's upcoming school year. Due to Covid-19 these events will be held virtually.

All parents are invited to join the PTA which holds regular meetings. The PTA hosts multiple events throughout the year in partnership with various community businesses including movie night, STEM night, a carnival, and diversity night.

Regular communication with families is maintained through the use of the a weekly folder. In third through fifth grades planners are used to assist students in being organized and sharing important information with parents and teachers. A training on the use of planners is done during Open House. A monthly calendar of important events is sent home at the beginning of each month and can be found on the school website. Grade levels and/or individual teachers send home newsletters as well.

In an effort to help parents support students at home, the school hosts family workshops focusing on a variety of topics including science, Florida Standards, transitioning to middle school, and summer reading. All workshops are supported by the Title 1 program.

School clubs are another opportunity for family and/or community involvement. Some clubs have local competitions that are open to families such as math and robotics. Girls on the Run participates in a community run where school staff and families come out in support of students. The Ukulele Club and Chorus host various evening performances which brings families to the school as well.

Lastly the school hosts three awards assemblies during the year to recognize students. Awards are presented for attendance, leadership, and academics. Those assemblies are open to families. These assemblies may occur virtually due to COVID-19.

#### **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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$318,517.07
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.5	\$181,823.02
			Notes: State certified resource teachers in reading and math to implement intervention models for lowest performing students. State certified teacher to provide coaching and assistance with data collection, disaggregation, and analysis. Paraprofessional to provide targeted intervention under the direction of certified teacher.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$74,087.56
			Notes: The school will continue to have an IIC/Title I Lead Coordinator to oversee implementation of progress monitoring, goal setting, and small group targeted intervention across the school.			
	5100	100-Salaries	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Other	0.75	\$25,242.07
			Notes: Paraprofessional to provide targeted intervention under the direction of a certified teacher.			
	5100	100-Salaries	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$9,125.70
			Notes: School will provide EDI tutoring in both ELA utilizing Achieve 3000 and math utilizing IXL for students in 3rd - 5th grade.			
	1382	690-Computer Software	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Other		\$8,442.00
			Notes: Achieve 3000 Reflex Math			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,960.32
			Notes: Lead Teacher Supplement			
	5100		0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$17,836.40
			Notes: Supplemental materials to support standards based instruction			
Total:						\$318,517.07