

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Northport K 8 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>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Northport K 8 School

250 NW FLORESTA DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/npk/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Glenn Rustay**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<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)	78%
<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 (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (49%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</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 St. Lucie 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Northport K 8 School

250 NW FLORESTA DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/npk/>

### 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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

### 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 St. Lucie 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.

Our mission is to ensure all students graduate from a safe and caring school, equipped with knowledge, skills, and the desire to succeed.

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

Northport K-8 in partnership with parents and community will become a premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. Northport K-8's name will be synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our school's promise is to move from good to great focusing on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for every student, every day. This is the Northport K-8 Way!

### 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
Bailey, Josie	Other	
Rustay, Glenn	Principal	
Cash, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Lankow, Diana	Instructional Coach	
Nieves, Melody	Instructional Coach	
Drost, Mehgan	Assistant Principal	
Hussein, Ahmed	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2009, Glenn Rustay

**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.*

5

**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.*

29

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

93

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<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)	78%
<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 (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (49%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</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	74	69	77	92	111	96	177	178	183	0	0	0	0	1057	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	15	19	18	13	26	43	56	0	0	0	0	204	
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	3	10	5	14	46	48	0	0	0	0	131	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	25	0	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	17	0	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	30	51	40	0	0	0	0	145	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	40	49	39	0	0	0	0	144	

#### 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	3	2	8	8	35	53	68	0	0	0	0	177

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

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

Saturday 9/5/2020

#### 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	72	85	90	108	95	116	167	224	194	0	0	0	0	1151	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	10	9	8	5	16	25	18	0	0	0	0	99	
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	8	8	6	14	50	61	0	0	0	0	156	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	20	19	74	55	68	0	0	0	0	248	

#### 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	1	5	6	6	12	37	41	0	0	0	0	108

#### 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	2	12	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	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	72	85	90	108	95	116	167	224	194	0	0	0	0	1151
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	10	9	8	5	16	25	18	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	8	8	6	14	50	61	0	0	0	0	156
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	20	19	74	55	68	0	0	0	0	248

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	1	5	6	6	12	37	41	0	0	0	0	108

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	2	12	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	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	51%	60%	61%	46%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	58%	59%	52%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	50%	54%	43%	52%	51%
Math Achievement	58%	58%	62%	51%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	62%	56%	59%	53%	55%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	52%	42%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	58%	56%	47%	50%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	74%	78%	68%	74%	75%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	47%	50%	-3%	58%	-11%
	2018	56%	46%	10%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	51%	11%	58%	4%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	45%	51%	-6%	54%	-9%
	2018	48%	47%	1%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2019	48%	49%	-1%	52%	-4%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	55%	-4%	62%	-11%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	54%	12%	64%	2%
	2018	46%	57%	-11%	62%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	50%	47%	3%	60%	-10%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
06	2019	51%	47%	4%	55%	-4%
	2018	56%	46%	10%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
07	2019	52%	50%	2%	54%	-2%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	54%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	49%	34%	15%	46%	3%
	2018	18%	35%	-17%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		31%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	46%	3%	53%	-4%
	2018	43%	50%	-7%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	53%	48%	5%	48%	5%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	50%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	67%	-67%	65%	-65%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	67%	0%	71%	-4%
2018	70%	71%	-1%	71%	-1%
Compare		-3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	51%	42%	61%	32%
2018	88%	54%	34%	62%	26%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
2018					

## 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	19	28	22	24	43	40	23	38			
ELL	30	41	43	47	59	56	35				
ASN	71	69		76	47						
BLK	40	51	34	47	57	37	34	74	100		
HSP	54	53	40	63	66	59	58	61	91		
MUL	56	49		69	67		67	60			
WHT	57	56	44	61	64	40	58	78	82		
FRL	45	51	37	52	61	43	49	60	90		
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	19	47	44	27	54	41	23	46			
ELL	22	47	40	34	56	38	17				
ASN	69	67		94	81						
BLK	35	50	45	35	47	42	35	62	90		
HSP	52	57	49	57	58	38	53	84	91		
MUL	53	61		54	47	40	64				
WHT	55	53	57	57	61	61	55	75	72		
FRL	43	52	51	46	53	45	47	67	77		
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	11	38	41	15	36	38	19	57			

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
ELL	17	34	35	24	29	33					
ASN	74	69		84	88		82				
BLK	33	49	47	37	40	31	32	62	69		
HSP	47	49	40	54	55	45	46	62	93		
MUL	40	50		45	52		27				
WHT	53	55	42	56	57	50	55	76	88		
FRL	41	49	42	46	51	43	40	66	87		

### 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	58
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	580
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	66
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	54
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	60
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	61
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	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

## Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The lowest 25%ile students achieving learning gains in ELA was our lowest performing area (39%). This was down from 51% last year.

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

The lowest 25%ile students achieving learning gains in ELA was our greatest decline from the previous year (-12 points). Of these students, 43% were SWD. One of the contributing factors was the lack of a certified ELA instructor for Middle School SWD, as well as three different instructors for the same class. Teacher retirement and first-year teachers were also contributing factors.

**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 lowest 25%ile students achieving learning gains in ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (-15 points). One of the contributing factors was the lack of a certified ELA instructor for Middle School SWD, as well as three different instructors for the same class. Teacher retirement and first-year teachers were also contributing factors.

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

Math proficiency and Math learning gains demonstrated the most improvement with a 6 point gain in each area.

### New Actions

We were in our second year of utilizing iReady books and toolkits

We purchased the iReady workbook for each student to consume

We were very strategic in utilizing our math coach in specific teacher's classrooms

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

We lost ground in two areas of the Early Warning Systems data.

Students with one or more suspensions went from 102 to 156 (+54 Or 35% gain)  
and

Students with a Level 1 on school-wide assessments went from 169 to 248 (+79 or 32% gain)

We will be addressing the suspensions by implementing SEL curriculums with fidelity and the level 1's will be addressed in our lowest bottom quartile goals.

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

1. SEL
2. ELA - lowest 25%tile (43% SWD students)
3. Math - lowest 25%tile (37% SWD students)



## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

##### Area of

##### Focus

##### Description and

##### Rationale:

The rationale for this focus is the decline of students making learning gains by 12 points, from 51% to 39%. Of these, 43% were SWD.

##### Measurable Outcome:

During the 2020-21 school year, general education teachers, as well as teachers of students with disabilities, will participate in collaborative learning and planning (CLP) meetings with their respective teams/grades. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons utilizing best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will result in a 15 point increase in ELA for the lowest 25%ile (including SWD).

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

##### Evidence- based Strategy:

Teachers will use research-based curriculum to provide explicit instruction in ELA.

##### Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:

Research has indicated that explicit instruction in text-based writing and reading comprehension will increase proficiency, which in turn results in learning gains.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development on SLPS Writing Plan, differentiation, data-driven instruction, and standards-based instruction.
2. Utilize District supports available through Office of Teaching and Learning.
3. Facilitate Collaborative learning/planning to address quality student work.

##### Person Responsible

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Two areas that our FSA scores declined in are ELA and Math lowest 25%ile students. This area includes 37% SWD students (55/149). Our ESSA data states that we need to improve on our SWD students success. By addressing our lowest 25%ile students we will address the needs of our students struggling the most.

**Measurable Outcome:** During the 2020-21 school year, general education and teachers of students with disabilities will participate in Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) meetings with their respected teams/grades. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons utilizing the best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will result in a 6 point increase in Math for the Lowest 25%ile (including SWD).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Glenn Rustay (glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teacher's instruction has the largest positive impact on student's achievement. Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction for their instruction in math.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Differentiated instruction is a high effect size strategy which allows teachers to work with small groups of students to instruct them on their level of learning and specific skill(s).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will utilize their student's data to identify their lowest 25%ile, SWD, near proficiency, and fragile students.
2. Math coach and instructional coach will instruct and model for teachers the SLC math routine with fidelity and how to implement differentiated instruction with the math routine.
3. Teachers will learn how to utilize Khan Academy and iReady instructional modules for whole group/ small group instruction, centers, and homework.
4. Teachers and students will track their individual data including proficiency and learning gains with FSA and Unit Assessments.
5. The master schedule and individual schedules will be modified and/or changed to allow as many students as possible a double block of math instruction including SWD students.

**Person Responsible** Glenn Rustay (glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Northport K - 8 saw an increase in the number of suspensions from 2018 to 2019 school years. One way to address this is to provide students with explicit instruction in social-emotional skills in order to provide them with strategies and coping skills.

**Measurable Outcome:** During the 2020-2021 school year, general education and teachers of students with disabilities will implement the district adopted SEL programs (Sanford Harmony or Lions Quest) with fidelity. Explicit social skills instruction will result in a 25% decrease in the number of suspensions for students in K – 8.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Meghan Drost (meghan.drost@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will utilize research-based programs to explicitly teach social-emotional skills (Sanford Harmony in K - 5 and Lions Quest in 6 - 8).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research has shown that explicit SEL lessons can reduce behavior problems while increasing academic performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Professional Development for teachers on SEL and SEL curriculum (August & September)
2. Ongoing support of teachers through monitoring and collaborative planning (ongoing throughout year)

**Person Responsible** Meghan Drost (meghan.drost@stlucieschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**We lost ground in two areas of the Early Warning Systems data.**

**Students with one or more suspensions went from 102 to 156 (+54 or 35% gain) and**

**Students with a Level 1 on school-wide assessments went from 169 to 248 (+79 or 32% gain)**

**We will be addressing the suspensions by implementing SEL curriculums with fidelity and the level 1's will be addressed in our lowest bottom quartile goals.**

**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 goals of the Northport K-8 Volunteer and Partner program are aligned with the core business of the school. Parent and Community Involvement are key cornerstones of the success of our school. Goals have been developed to not only ensure Parental and Community Involvement at Northport K-8 School but our goals are aligned with the goals of Saint Lucie County School district.

Northport K-8 , through a variety of opportunities throughout the school year, will ensure that our goals are met or exceeded. Our target for volunteer hours is 8050 hours and to increase Business Partners from the community to 7.

Goals:

To provide individualized educational assistance to students through mentors and tutorships.

To relieve the teacher of some non instructional tasks.

To reinforce lesson skills

To stimulate community interest, concerns and support for the education system.

To provide an opportunity for interested community members to become directly involved in the educational process.

To strengthen school and community relations through direct and positive participation in the school

To promote Goodwill ambassadorship within our community.

ALL programs contingent upon current policies regarding Safe Return to School.

Opportunities:

Veteran Partners In Education Program

2 book fairs with literacy fair

PTO meetings monthly

Unity Day Bullying Awareness Walk with families in October

Community Reading Day

9/11 Commemoration program

Grand Parents Day

Student of the Month

Americorps Mentorship program

Honor Roll

21st Century after school program

Participate in Parental Involvement Award

Participate in Gold and Silver School Awards

Nominate Outstanding Volunteers of the Year

Participate in 5 Star Program

Activities for Celebrate Literacy Week in January with Parent Invitations

In October, Parents and community members will participate in Safe Schools Week and Red Ribbon Week

with assistance from Counseling Services and Resource Officer  
 Institute class and school newsletters as well as Administrative School Messenger

### **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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00