

Bay District Schools

Northside 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Northside Elementary School

2001 NORTHSIDE DR, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lora Frowert

Start Date for this Principal: 12/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Northside Elementary School

2001 NORTHSIDE DR, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

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	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

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 Bay 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.

The students, parents and community of Northside Elementary School will provide an environment where students feel secure, valued and confident to learn in diverse ways while mastering skills to become life-long learners and contributors to the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A collaborative focus on every student every day.

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
Frowert, Lora	Principal	
Allen, Alison	Teacher, K-12	
Lewis, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Ensminger, Katrina	Teacher, K-12	
Hornkohl, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	
Nield, Marcy	Teacher, K-12	
Gall, Chad	Assistant Principal	
Campbell, Jamie	School Counselor	
Cox, Angel	Teacher, K-12	
Quimuyog, Pamela	Teacher, K-12	
Peters, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Pena, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Harvey, Amy	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 12/15/2020, Lora Frowert

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	100	79	84	91	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	7	25	20	9	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	1	3	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	4	4	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	9	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	93	74	75	83	89	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	18	14	15	25	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	1	6	5	7	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	7	8	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	15	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	2	7	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	9	6	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	93	74	75	83	89	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	18	14	15	25	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	1	6	5	7	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	7	8	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	15	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	2	7	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	9	6	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	62%	55%	57%	47%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	59%	58%	50%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	57%	53%	52%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	56%	63%	47%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	54%	62%	42%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	42%	51%	45%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	53%	53%	33%	44%	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	59%	61%	-2%	58%	1%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	57%	56%	1%	56%	1%
	2018	51%	50%	1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	59%	-7%	64%	-12%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	60%	-10%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	57	66	53	45	57	53	45				
ELL	42	64		47	64						
BLK	28	50	50	25	38	45	17				
HSP	39	59	70	48	64						
MUL	53	45		47	55						
WHT	76	72		68	66	58	71				
FRL	59	64	61	54	56	53	47				
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	34	34	43	32	33	33	11				
ELL	29	20		24							
BLK	30	38	23	18	34	43	10				
HSP	44	39	17	47	43		29				
MUL	50	36		75	55						
WHT	65	58	61	58	54	22	52				
FRL	52	49	32	46	46	33	43				
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	25	45	50	29	33	39	16				
ELL	23			46							
BLK	22	37	41	18	30	36	8				
HSP	40	50		43	31		38				
MUL	36	67		45	56		30				
WHT	57	51	63	56	45	55	42				
FRL	42	46	47	41	40	48	29				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	58
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	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
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	69
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	58
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 school-wide data component that performed the lowest is Math Lowest 25th Percentile, 51%. This was also the lowest performing area from 2018; however there was a 16% increase from 2018 (35%) to 2019

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

Northside had an increase of at least 5% in all data components.

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 school-wide data component with the biggest gap when compared to the state average is Math Achievement with a difference of 6%. It should be noted that the gap

was closed by 4% from last school year. (2018: State 62%, Northside 52%, 2019: State 63%, Northside 57%)

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

The school-wide data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile with an increase of 21% (35%-56%). Lowest quartile students were provided individualized targeted daily interventions and supports throughout the school year based on monthly data analysis.

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

Northside has one subgroup area that did not meet the target of 41%. The Black/African American subgroup score was 36%.

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

1. Black/African American Subgroup
2. ELA Achievement
3. Behavior/Discipline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Northside Elementary will increase the number of students making learning gains and demonstrating proficiency in ELA by planning, preparing and implementing targeted differentiated instruction that meets the intent and rigor of the standards.

English Language Arts (ELA) remains our area of focus. While Northside's overall proficiency level in ELA increased 6% from 56% to 62% and our overall learning gains increased 14% from 51% to 65%, both areas remain below our target of 70% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA proficiency will increase by 3% from 62% to 65%.
ELA learning gains will increase by 5% from 65% to 70%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lora Frowert (frowelr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Standards aligned targeted Tier I instruction utilizing high quality text and providing additional individualized supports at Tier II and III.

Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:

Implementing the EL Curriculum will ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum, using high quality text and encompassing all standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue to build and strengthen Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) at each grade level. This will provide opportunity for collaborative teaching which will enhance the level of instruction provided and ensure that assessments are aligned to the rigor and intent of the standards. Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs to plan and prepare for effective standards aligned instructional delivery and assessment. ELA Liaisons will attend quarterly liaison meetings and bring information back to the PLC.

Person Responsible

Lora Frowert (frowelr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of the Simplified MTSS/RTI at Work process will continue, allowing us to strengthen and support the school's academic program through strategic focus. A universal spreadsheet will be used to track data on students that need extra intervention. The universal spreadsheet will be utilized during monthly MTSS Leadership Team meeting and Grade Level Data Chats, where all teachers in grade level PLCs, instructional coaches, support team members (to include MTSS Interventionist- School and District Level) and administration discuss the needs of the students and develop a plan to address the needs. Having the sheet available to teachers and staff allows them to review and update information in real time for us to problem solve the MTSS process for academics as well as behavior.

Person Responsible

Angela Pena (penaac@bay.k12.fl.us)

Timely flexible interventions are implemented with fidelity and student progress is monitored regularly. Tier II interventions are provided by the classroom teacher and Tier III interventions provided by the MTSS Intervention Team.

Person Responsible

Katrina Ensminger (ensmika@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Northside Elementary School will implement 15 minutes of daily Character Education in order to decrease student discipline referrals by 5%. Implementing character education daily will teach behavior expectations and how to appropriately respond to tough situations.
Measurable Outcome:	Effective instruction in character education will lead to a decrease of discipline incidents by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chad Gall (gallch@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective instruction in character education will lead to a decrease of discipline incidents by 5%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers embed character education into their instruction, the classroom becomes a more caring, respectful, and inclusive community.

Action Steps to Implement

Core Essentials is a character development curriculum that will be used school-wide to provide a common language for behavior expectations. This curriculum will define and teach students the expected behavior for school. The Core Essential Big Three Behavior Expectations will be posted in classrooms, hallways, cafeteria, and common areas.

Person Responsible Chad Gall (gallch@bay.k12.fl.us)

Positive behavior will be celebrated at our monthly pep rally. Each class will nominate the student that best exemplifies the core behavior trait of the month. Each student will receive a certificate, a Viking t-shirt and attend a special breakfast with their family (pending visitation policy).

Person Responsible Chad Gall (gallch@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Northside's Black/African American subgroup is performing slightly below 41% threshold set by the state, with a rate of 36%. Academic achievement data will be analyzed during weekly PLC meetings and monthly data chats.

Teachers will employ a variety of learning strategies that engage students in active participation, address multiple learning styles, and stimulate students' intellectual interests. Instructional interventions and/or acceleration will be provided by classroom teachers and interventional staff. Social emotional supports will be provided by the school based Behavioral Interventionist and Triad Team (mental health therapist and social workers). Building and maintaining positive relationships and recruitment of Elevate Bay Mentors will remain a priority.

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.

Northside Elementary School provides support for the physical, social, and emotional needs of our students. Northside partners with several local churches and community programs to provide school supplies, food (weekend backpack program), and clothing to our families in need. The Guidance counselor provides lists of community resources to our families and regularly meets with parents to discuss individual needs. Character education and bullying prevention are integrated into the school curriculum. PanCare employees coordinate the health needs of our students, as well as coordinating annual health screenings and dental care. School staff coordinate with resource teachers, school psychologist, behavior interventionist and other district staff to administer various screenings as needed for individual students. Telehealth programs are in place to provide physical and mental healthcare; including a paraprofessional assigned to coordinate care. Northside provides services that support the counseling, assessment, referral and educational needs of our students. Using the MTSS process, staff identify student needs and design differentiated instruction and/or interventions to support the learning of all students. Students receive support through specialized programs such as Tier II and Tier III support through specialized programs such as a social skills group, Zoo U individualized software program, Check & Connect with a staff member, and mentoring. School staff collaborates with members of the Triad Team as well as outside resources (social workers, behavior interventionist, Florida Therapy counselors, Anchorage Children's Home, Elevate Bay and other community partners) to discuss coordination, implementation, and efficiency of services and works to identify new strategies or resources to benefit our students.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00