

The School District of Desoto

# Nocatee 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Nocatee Elementary School

4846 SW SHORES AVE, Nocatee, FL 34268

<http://nes.desotoschools.com/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Brandy Tackett**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2018

<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)	100%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (38%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Desoto 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](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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

## Nocatee Elementary School

4846 SW SHORES AVE, Nocatee, FL 34268

<http://nes.desotoschools.com/>

### 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	66%

### 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 Desoto 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.

The mission of NES is to prepare all students to be successful citizens and productive workers.

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

The vision of NES is that all students will be confident learners and respected leaders.

### 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
Andrews, Jermaine	Principal	
Meredith, Nikki	Assistant Principal	
Mays, Kaycee	Teacher, ESE	
Guisti, Rebecca	Administrative Support	
Hooper, Cari	School Counselor	
Marshall, Christine	Attendance/Social Work	
Sorrells, Sarah	Instructional Coach	
Moreno, Babette	Other	
Moxley, Susan	Other	
Beeler, Amanda	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/18/2018, Brandy Tackett

**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.*

5

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

38

#### 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)	100%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (38%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<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	52	64	75	75	116	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	31	27	44	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	6	3	3	6	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	

**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	3	15	45	52	88	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271

**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	1	0	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	1	4	9	48	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/19/2020

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	29%	38%	57%	29%	31%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	52%	58%	37%	38%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	51%	53%	37%	39%	52%
Math Achievement	38%	45%	63%	39%	43%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	57%	62%	54%	49%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	55%	51%	35%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	37%	53%	29%	21%	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	24%	34%	-10%	58%	-34%
	2018	20%	29%	-9%	57%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	24%	37%	-13%	58%	-34%
	2018	26%	39%	-13%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	36%	41%	-5%	56%	-20%
	2018	26%	33%	-7%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	34%	40%	-6%	62%	-28%
	2018	28%	32%	-4%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	34%	51%	-17%	64%	-30%
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	62%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	43%	43%	0%	60%	-17%
	2018	44%	41%	3%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	36%	-4%	53%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	29%	32%	-3%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	25	30	38	23	40						
ELL	18	44	56	39	64	81	11				
BLK	32			40							
HSP	23	44	56	44	65	67	30				
WHT	37	59	63	30	47	58	39				
FRL	29	48	53	41	59	63	30				
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	5	30	31	11	40	50	9				
ELL	16	37	50	31	44	50					
BLK	23			21	50						
HSP	22	41	48	38	43	53	20				
WHT	28	43	36	33	47	43	39				
FRL	24	42	44	34	45	44	28				
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	5	32	35	12	31	31	8				
ELL	11	28	22	29	52	33	14				
BLK	36			27	40						
HSP	24	28	20	40	54	31	33				
WHT	32	40	48	40	56	41	27				
FRL	27	35	37	37	52	35	27				

### ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	36
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	47
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	50
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	47
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.**

ELA (Reading) proficiency at NES is below district and state expectations. When comparing 2019 district and state results, NES is 8% and 28% below, respectively. ELA (Reading) proficiency at NES was the lowest performing data component during the 2018 assessment year.

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

ELA (Reading) proficiency at NES for the 2019 assessment year showed the greatest decline in Grade 4. When compared to the 2018 assessment year, there was a 2% decline in Grade 4 for same grade comparison. During the 2018-19 SY, a new curriculum was adopted and implemented at NES. NES is continuing to implement research-based strategies to assist teachers unpack the standards and effectively align curriculum to yield high student outcomes.

**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.**

ELA (Reading) proficiency at NES for the 2019 assessment year was 29%. The state average was 57%, which is 28% higher than NES. This data component shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Although this gap was closed by 3% in 2019, NES is continuing to implement research-based strategies to assist teachers in planning and delivering targeted instruction, using a "what students should know and be able to do" approach.

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

Math gains for the lowest 25% percentile showed the most improvement. When compared to the 2018 assessment year (45%), NES increased student learning gains by 18%. The Eureka Math program is used with fidelity at every grade level. Teachers collaborate two days per week, at minimum, to plan high-quality instruction. During each collaboration session, teachers discuss the progress of individual students and their mastery of grade-level curriculum. The academic needs of students are also discussed and interventions/instructional strategies are implemented to ensure learning gaps are addressed. In collaboration with the Instructional Coach or Assistant Principal, teachers engage in an analysis of ongoing student performance data (Tier II/Tier III students).

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

Based upon ESSA data for the 2019 assessment year, there are two subgroups not meeting the minimum federal percentage points (41%) - SWD and African American. An increase of 9% is needed for SWD and an increase of 5% is needed for African American. NES will continue our efforts to increase or maintain the federal percentage points earned for other subgroups during the 2019 assessment year.

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

1. ELA (Reading) Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Through a monthly review of data including, but not limited to, classroom assessments, benchmark assessment data, teacher collected data, and STAR results, specific areas of need can be identified and teachers can focus on one intervention at a time and implement rigorous instruction to accelerate and scaffold student learning.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the year 2021, there will be a minimum eight-percentage point increase in ELA (Reading) as measured by EOY state assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jermaine Andrews (jermaine.andrews@desotoschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Increase teachers' knowledge of students' specific needs through deep data analysis
- Leverage weekly collaboration to design instruction and common assessments based on students' needs
- Utilize high yield curriculum to ensure students meet the rigor of the standards
- Students in identified subgroups will obtain a minimum of 41% of Federal Percent of Points Index (SWD and Black/African American)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Develop and maintain system to assess and track student mastery of standards
- Meet individual student needs by maximizing the impact of intervention time
- Provide teachers with collaboration time to analyze data and make data informed decisions to improve instruction
- Leverage curriculum programs and resources that expose students to grade level standards and/or accelerate student learning

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review school/student data at school opening training and provide each grade level with a monitoring tool for student mastery of grade level skills
2. Structure intervention groups to reflect students' needs based on mastery charts, STAR, and teacher input
3. Teachers will submit plans/skill focus for intervention groups
4. Provide teachers with district pacing guides, state resources, and lesson plan template
5. Set monthly collaboration schedule to provide a minimum of two days of grade-level planning, one day of district articulation, two days of data analysis for ELA (core instruction and intervention), and one day of instructional skill building
6. Use curriculum pacing guides to break down what students will know and what they can show as lesson outcome by: identifying foundational skills, fostering student engagement, and planning scaffolding activities

**Person Responsible:** Jermaine Andrews (jermaine.andrews@desotoschools.com)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Through a monthly review of data including, but not limited to, classroom assessments, benchmark assessment data, teacher collected data, and STAR results, specific areas of need can be identified and teachers can focus on one intervention at a time and implement rigorous instruction to accelerate and scaffold student learning.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the year 2021, there will be a minimum eight-percentage point increase in Math as measured by EOY state assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jermaine Andrews (jermaine.andrews@desotoschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Adjust math block to increase instructional time and intervention
- Utilize monthly collaboration schedule to unpack the standards and identify prerequisite skills
- Provide math instruction that moves from concrete pictorial to abstract
- Students in identified subgroups will obtain a minimum of 41% of Federal Percent of Points Index (SWD and Black/African American)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Develop master schedule to increase daily math instruction and intervention
- Increase teachers' depth of knowledge of math standards and foundational skills
- Develop instructional strategies that use students' background knowledge to build new learning
- Provide foundation skill practice through the use of daily number talks at the launch of each math lesson

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide teachers an opportunity for vertical articulation to identify math progressions and key foundational skills across grade levels
2. Utilize data to determine what foundation skills students may need reinforced or taught
3. Develop teachers' capacity with the use of mathematical tools to build student knowledge during collaboration time
4. Determine what students should "know" and "show" for each standard and embed in the instructional plan and create/analyze common assessments (formative) using a performance scale that is related to Marzano
5. Provide professional development on the use of number talks to introduce strategies and ongoing support through collaboration time

**Person Responsible:** Jermaine Andrews (jermaine.andrews@desotoschools.com)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Through a monthly review of data including, but not limited to, classroom assessments, benchmark assessment data, teacher collected data, and STAR results, specific areas of need can be identified and teachers can focus on one intervention at a time and implement rigorous instruction to accelerate and scaffold student learning.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the year 2021, there will be a minimum eight-percentage point increase in Science as measured by EOY state assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jermaine Andrews (jermaine.andrews@desotoschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** - Adjust science block to increase instructional time for evaluation, investigation, and inquiry integration

- Utilize collaboration time to unpack the standards and identify content limits  
 - Provide instruction that enhances students' conceptual understanding of science  
 - Students in identified subgroups will obtain a minimum of 41% of Federal Percent of Points Index (SWD and Black/African American)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** - Increase students' science engagement and proficiency  
 - Increase teacher capacity and depth of knowledge of science standards and foundational skills  
 - Connect science to other subject areas to promote students' understanding and use of scientific language

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Integrate hands-on-activities learning activities and facilitate opportunities for science discourse among students
2. Enrich science curriculum by creating connections to science careers and professionals within our school community
3. Provide teachers an opportunity for vertical articulation to identify science progressions and key foundational skills across grade levels
4. Use science data to drive instruction and the improvement of teaching practices

**Person Responsible:** Jermaine Andrews (jermaine.andrews@desotoschools.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Progress towards the priorities within the Schoolwide Improvement Plan will be shared regularly with our faculty, staff, parents/families, and School Advisory Council (SAC).**

**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.

Research indicates parent and community involvement has a positive effect on student achievement. The continued success of our students is built upon the establishment of trusting relationships between parents/families and other community stakeholders. As part of our commitment to supporting the needs of students, Nocatee Elementary (NES) will host parent involvement events (virtual options will be made available) designed to inform and engage parents/families in the learning process. These events will include: literacy, math, and science nights with parent friendly activities that can be used at home to practice learned skills. A curriculum night will also be held to orient parents to the following: grade level curriculum; teacher expectations, routines, and procedures; school rules and policies, etc. Training is also available to parents on the use of Skyward to monitor their student's progress, attendance, and discipline. The "Leading Forward to Success" philosophy (leadership by listening, learning, and leading) has been implemented since the 2018-19 SY through school-wide initiatives involving students, teachers, and parents. In addition, NES is exploring PBIS for the 2020-21 SY and how best to implement. The NES website, Facebook page, and school App all serve as methods to increase family engagement.

#### **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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00