

Orange County Public Schools

Northlake Park Community Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Northlake Park Community Elementary

9055 NORTHLAKE PKWY, Orlando, FL 32827

<https://northlakees.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Emily Archie

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
2020-21 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Northlake Park Community Elementary

9055 NORTHLAKE PKWY, Orlando, FL 32827

<https://northlakees.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	21%
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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create exciting and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure that every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Parker, Lee	Principal	Oversee all School Operations, Assist with Discipline, Evaluations/ Observations, Lesson Plans, Report Cards Check, Buck's Bulletin, SAC meetings, School Improvement Plan, Safe School Plan, Progress Monitoring of data and students, Attend PLCs/Common Planning and PTA Meetings
Riley, Gloria	Assistant Principal	Principal Designee in Absence of Principal, Assist with all discipline, Evaluations/Observations, Lesson Plan Checks, Report Card Checks Safe School Plan, School Improvement Plan, FSSAT, SAC: Membership/Roster/ School survey, Arrival/Dismissal issues, Arrend PLC's/Common Planning , Office and Para Meeting and Facilities/Custodial.
Hanrahan, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Testing Coordinator (FSA, i-Ready, EOC etc.) MTSS Coordinator, iReady contact, Transportation Contact, PD Points, Textbook Coordinator, Attend PLC's/Common Planning
Caballero, Janet	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Needs and Compliance data, ELL Parent/Teacher Meetings. Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (ESOL)-meeting coordinator, IPT & WIDA contact and test administer, MTSS student Reviews meetings, Teacher Support for ELL students, Small Group Interventions
Maneri, Brenda	Dean	Discipline Dean ESE Consultations, Title 9 Contact, Teacher Support-behavior Field Trips, Picture Day COntract, Small Group Instruction as Needed, Code of Contact, MTSS student Reviews Meetings, Cafeteria Rewards Coordinator, Patrol Sponsor, Veterans Day
Miski, Elia	School Counselor	Character Education, Social Emotional Support (SEL), Academic planning and success, Postsecondary Planning and Success, Threat Assessment Contact, Small Group Interventions Assist with Behavior Plan

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/23/2016, Emily Archie

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.*

8

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

677

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	4	102	108	108	130	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	584
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	8	11	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

2020-21 - 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	8	95	107	133	142	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	11	12	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	0	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	0	0	1	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

2020-21 - 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	8	95	107	133	142	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	11	12	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	0	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	0	0	1	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				72%	57%	57%	74%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	58%	58%	63%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	52%	53%	43%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				73%	63%	63%	73%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	61%	62%	63%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	48%	51%	45%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				66%	56%	53%	67%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	63%	13%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitor tool that is utilized for ELA and Math is i-Ready for each grade level. For science, the progress monitoring is PMA.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(30) 31%	(54) 55%	(71) 69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(1) 22%	(12) 38%	(16) 50%
	Students With Disabilities	(1) 17%	(2) 40%	(3) 50%
	English Language Learners	(3) 5%	(7) 37%	(12) 57%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(20) 21%	(54) 56%	(68) 66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(6) 19%	(11) 34%	(15) 47%
	Students With Disabilities	(0) 0%	(2) 40%	(2) 33%
	English Language Learners	(2) 11%	(5) 28%	(11) 52%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(27) 31%	(47) 49%	(58)60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(8) 29%	(11) 39%	(12) 43%
	Students With Disabilities	(1) 17%	(1) 14%	(2) 29%
	English Language Learners	(2) 13%	(4) 24%	(6) 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(9) 10%	(26) 28%	(54) 56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(1) 4%	(4) 14%	(10) 36%
	Students With Disabilities	(0) 0%	(1) 17%	(2) 29%
	English Language Learners	(1) 13%	(2) 12%	(4) 22%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(53) 45%	(65) 55%	(91) 76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(10) 26%	(16) 42%	(25) 66%
	Students With Disabilities	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(1) 14%
	English Language Learners	(4) 14%	(9) 31%	(16) 53%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(18) 15%	(33) 28%	(74) 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(1) 3%	(7) 18%	(24) 63%
	Students With Disabilities	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(1) 14%
	English Language Learners	(0) 0%	(5) 17%	(16) 53%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(43) 34%	(68) 53%	(74) 58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(9) 20%	(17) 38%	(21) 50%
	Students With Disabilities	(1) 8%	(2) 18%	(4) 40%
	English Language Learners	(3) 9%	(8) 25%	(14) 42%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(16) 13%	(44) 34%	(88) 68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(3) 7%	(8) 18%	(22) 50%
	Students With Disabilities	(1) 8%	(3) 27%	(5) 50%
	English Language Learners	(0) 0%	(6) 19%	(16) 48%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(23) 18%	(39) 32%	(44) 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(5) 10%	(12) 25%	(7) 15%
	Students With Disabilities	(1) 17%	(0) 0%	(1) 17%
	English Language Learners	(1) 3%	(3) 9%	(1) 3%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(14) 12%	(39) 32%	(60) 48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(1) 2%	(10) 21%	(15) 31%
	Students With Disabilities	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(1) 17%
	English Language Learners	(0) 0%	(4) 13%	(8) 24%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	(69) 57%	(76) 64%	(72) 60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(20) 43%	(22) 49%	(18) 40%
	Students With Disabilities	(2) 25%	(2) 29%	(1) 17%
	English Language Learners	(10) 32%	(11) 37%	(5) 16%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	32			44							
ELL	60	62	65	62	31	36	23				
ASN	92			96							
BLK	86			79							
HSP	69	62	60	70	44	25	43				
WHT	85	56		86	67		68				
FRL	65	55	62	65	43	28	33				
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	21	46	46	29	53	50	19				
ELL	52	59	64	56	73	62	48				
ASN	79	64		89	86						
BLK	58	67	30	29	43	33	27				
HSP	65	66	59	66	72	54	59				
WHT	84	67		89	80		84				
FRL	55	58	56	54	65	50	45				
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	26	45	28	29	45	37	33				
ELL	48	52	43	48	48	46	44				
ASN	87	83		94	78		82				
BLK	45	22	18	47	44	45					
HSP	65	59	45	68	60	45	62				
WHT	90	74	70	83	68		82				
FRL	55	50	38	58	57	43	53				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	94
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	83
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In reading, the trend that emerges across the grade levels is that each subgroup increased between 12-52 percentile points except for 5th grade students. Regarding 5th grade, Economically Disadvantaged students increased 5 percentile points and Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners remaining the same throughout the school year. Another trend that emerged is our English Language Learners made the greatest increase across grades 1-4 with the average of 38 percentile points.

In math, Economically Disadvantaged students made an average increase of 38.4 percentile points, Students with Disabilities, made an average increase of 35.4 percentile points and English Language Learners increased an average of 27 percentile points. As the data displays, the emerging trend is Economically Disadvantaged students made the greatest average gain with English Language Learners falling slightly below by 3 percentile points.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off our i-Ready progress monitoring tool and 2019 state assessments, our lowest performing area is SWD in math and reading with proficiency at 28% (math) and 29% (reading). We find that the students have trouble with perseverance and tend to give up when the passages are too long and when math problems require multiple steps and/or goes beyond DOK level 1.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Based on our 2019 FSA Math data, the lowest area of performance was Math learning gains of our lowest 25% of learners at 54%. However, our 2021 EOY i-Ready data displays an increase to 56% in Math learning gains for our bottom 25% which is an increase of 2 percentile points. Those data points demonstrate the closest relationship due to no 2020 FSA Math data scores.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on 2019 FSA ELA, our black subgroup showed the most improvement with a 45% increase.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to our Black subgroup showing improvement is the continuation of implementing close reading strategies, text dependent questionings and providing push in support.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Strategies we will need to implement or continue are: Continuing our 3rd year of Cambridge Academy in grades 3-5 and increase the program to all grade levels and teachers, support students Social Emotional Learning by implementing the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language while implementing Year 2 plan along with Learning 3-5 B.E.S.T. Standards and implementing K-2 B.E.S.T. Standards.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Developments will include: Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership Year 2 Plan which includes sessions 1-3 and SELL Showcase of Learning for 2021-2022 school year, B.E.S.T Standards PD'S with a strong focus on understanding 3-5 B.E.S.T. Standards and support for the implementation of K-2 B.E.S.T. Standards and Cambridge Global Perspective

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

During our weekly PLC meetings, and bi-weekly leadership meetings, data tool will be implemented to monitor students' progress academically as well as emotional.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following needs:
 Learning gains in math for our bottom 25%
 Increasing performance proficiency in ELA for our Students with Disabilities
 Build family home relationship by strengthening a culture for social and emotional learning

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we would like to see a correlation from the implementation of SEL work impact our ELA and Math proficiency scores as measured on the FSA. Our goal is to see the scores increase by three to five percentile points. In addition to our school wide FSA scores increasing, we would like to also see our bottom 25 percentile make learning gains in math and our SWD students increase three to five percentile points.

Monitoring: We will continue utilizing the DPLC process and move from literacy focus (close reading) to Social and Emotional Learning. In addition, we will transition from Year 1 SELL Professional Development to Year 2 focusing on the goal, plan and implement intentionally structured opportunities for adults to integrate and monitor resources and strategies to grow every student academically, socially and emotionally. We will begin the process by collecting baseline data on student SEL needs and determine program resources and implement a plan for continuous school improvement. In addition to collecting SEL baseline data, we will collect academic baseline data and develop an understanding of the 2020-2021 school year data. Data chats, PLC meetings and SELL sessions 1-3 and Action Planning Document forms will be completed as our monitoring tool through the school year. The progress monitoring form includes trend data from classroom walkthroughs, culture & climate data and qualitative data from stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lee Parker (lee.parker@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies and deliberate school supports for families.
 Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs and family needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.
 Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, our school can implement

efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Beginning in the 2019-2020 school year, NLP instituted a Cambridge Academy for targeted 4th and 5th grade students. This is an accelerated type of program using academic standards created by the University of Cambridge. During the 2020-2021 it was expanded to a 3rd grade class as well. We are now ready to implement a portion of this program throughout the school. This year we will be implementing a project based learning program called Global Perspectives as well as teaching all students about the Cambridge Learner Attributes.

Measurable Outcome: By exposing students to higher levels of thinking and focusing in "real world" applications of knowledge, we would like to see our FSA achievement and learning gains scores increase by 3 to 5 percentage points respectively.

Monitoring: It is expected for grade levels to complete up to four Global Perspective challenges this school year. The accelerated classes may complete more if time permits. The principal and assistant principal will monitor the implementation of these challenges.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lee Parker (lee.parker@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Cambridge Global Perspectives is a unique, transformational program that helps students at every stage of school education develop outstanding transferable skills, including critical thinking and research and collaboration.

This innovative and stimulating skills-based program places academic study in a practical, real-world context. The program develops the skills of research, analysis, evaluation, reflection, collaboration and communication.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Cambridge Primary Global Perspectives is taught through a series of Challenges. Each challenge encourages learners to become independent, active and lifelong learners. They include activities that require learners to make decisions about where to find information and how to present the information. They also include guidance on how to encourage learners to consider and connect personal, local and global perspectives.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

NorthLake Park Community School's comparison data from Safe Schools for Alex reveals insightful information. Out of all the elementary schools across the state of Florida, the number of incidents per 100 students are 1.0 and in our district, the number of incidents per 100 students is 3.0. This places NorthLake Park Community .7 above the state and 1.3 below Orange County. Safe Schools for Alex incident ranking falls in three categories: violent incidents which we ranked # 1,186 in the state and #59 in the district, property incidents we place #1 in the state and #1 in the district. This data clearly displays areas of strength and opportunities. By focusing on the school wide implementation of SEL, we can expect to see relationships build out of respect become culturally embedded in the school culture.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, ongoing engagement in district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success will be implemented. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school includes: parents, students and community members. This core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff. In addition to SAC, information is shared via school events such as Open House, Curriculum Night PTA meetings and ELL Parent Leadership Council Meetings.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00