

St. Lucie Public Schools

Northport K 8 School



2021-22 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	21
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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 was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bailey, Josie	Testing Specialist	
Cash, Lisa		
Drost, Mehgan		
Hussein, Ahmed		
Lankow, Diana		
Nieves, Melody		
Rustay, Glenn		

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

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,215

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

7

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

7

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	77	73	78	95	113	99	186	183	190	0	0	0	0	1094	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	15	21	31	18	34	39	42	0	0	0	0	230	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	3	9	36	32	23	0	0	0	0	109	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	14	4	35	37	32	0	0	0	0	124	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	21	8	46	54	28	0	0	0	0	163	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	20	51	40	0	0	0	0	135	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	40	49	39	0	0	0	0	144	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	4	2	2	0	117	113	105	0	0	0	0	344	
	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	1	1	38	47	34	101	101	105	0	0	0	0	428	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	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

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	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

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				51%	60%	61%	49%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	58%	59%	54%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	50%	54%	51%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				58%	58%	62%	52%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				62%	56%	59%	56%	57%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	46%	52%	47%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				52%	58%	56%	51%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				71%	74%	78%	74%	74%	77%

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	47%	50%	-3%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	48%	49%	-1%	52%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	47%	3%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2021					
	2019	51%	47%	4%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
07	2021					
	2019	52%	50%	2%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	49%	34%	15%	46%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	46%	3%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	48%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	67%	67%	0%	71%	-4%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	51%	42%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for K-8 was iReady Diagnostics. Science and Civics progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66/35%	66/29%	66/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/33%	51/225	51/30%
	Students With Disabilities	14/21%	14/43%	14/43%
	English Language Learners	21/24%	21/5%	21/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66/24%	66/28%	66/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/26%	51/22%	51/31%
	Students With Disabilities	14/36%	14/46%	14/54%
	English Language Learners	21/10%	21/14%	21/5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75/71%	75/72%	75/81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/66%	62/68%	62/76%
	Students With Disabilities	18/50%	18/35%	18/44%
	English Language Learners	10/70%	10/55%	10/67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	73/70%	73/79%	73/89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/65%	60/76%	60/85%
	Students With Disabilities	17/53%	17/59%	17/60%
	English Language Learners	10/60%	10/60%	10/80%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	92/59	92/81	92/76
	Economically Disadvantaged	75/56	75/67	75/73
	Students With Disabilities	28/21%	28/29%	28/41%
	English Language Learners	16/44%	16/56%	16/73%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	92/55	92/69	92/80
	Economically Disadvantaged	75/53%	75/63%	75/77%
	Students With Disabilities	28/29%	28/36%	28/59%
	English Language Learners	16/50%	16/50%	16/50%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	105/76%	105/75%	105/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78/77%	78/74%	78/78%
	Students With Disabilities	26/31%	26/41%	26/43%
	English Language Learners	11/55%	11/58%	11/73%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	106/62%	106/76%	106/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	79/58%	79/76%	79/76%
	Students With Disabilities	27/26%	27/46%	27/50%
	English Language Learners	11/73%	11/75%	11/80%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	97/60%	97/62%	97/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/60%	72/61%	72/64%
	Students With Disabilities	26/23%	26/39%	26/36%
	English Language Learners	11/46%	11/55%	11/56%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	97/66%	97/70%	97/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/63%	72/63%	72/64%
	Students With Disabilities	26/39%	26/46%	26/36%
	English Language Learners	11/64%	11/73%	11/56%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	92/37%	92/35%	90/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/35%	68/33%	68/39%
	Students With Disabilities	24/21%	24/13%	24/17%
	English Language Learners	11/18%	11/9%	11/27%
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	168/52%	168/44%	168/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	131/39%	131/41%	131/33%
	Students With Disabilities	31/16%	31/17%	31/8%
	English Language Learners	12/25%	12/27%	12/19%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	151/46%	151/53%	151/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	118/45%	118/54%	118/57%
	Students With Disabilities	29/17%	29/26%	29/28%
	English Language Learners	11/27%	11/47%	11/38%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	162/48%	162/48%	162/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	134/77%	134/44%	134/52%
	Students With Disabilities	31/16%	31/17%	31/8%
	English Language Learners	12/25%	12/27%	12/19%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	149/50%	148/52%	149/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	122/49%	122/34%	122/55%
	Students With Disabilities	33/27%	33/42%	33/40%
	English Language Learners	11/18%	11/29%	11/39%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	172/31%	172/24%	172/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	138/30%	138/24%	138/42%
	Students With Disabilities	34/35%	34/18%	34/38%
	English Language Learners	13/15%	13/23%	13/58%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	169/50%	169/55%	169/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	126/48%	126/50%	126/57%
	Students With Disabilities	35/14%	35/31%	35/26%
	English Language Learners	8/13%	8/29%	8/29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/29%	83/25%	83/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/28%	65/16%	65/29%
	Students With Disabilities	27/15%	27/17%	27/23%
	English Language Learners	6/33%	6/33%	6/33%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	169/39%	169/44%	169/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	127/33%	127/38%	127/37%
	Students With Disabilities	30/17%	30/21%	30/18%
	English Language Learners	6/0%	6/0%	6/0%

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	19	38	28	17	31	26	18	50			
ELL	31	46	40	32	47	38	26	83			
ASN	58			67							
BLK	33	35	32	30	35	37	23	54	33		
HSP	43	47	36	39	37	29	43	76	57		
MUL	38	33		46	38		33				
WHT	53	53	25	50	47	41	58	74	63		
FRL	39	41	27	38	38	32	37	67	46		
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				

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
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		

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	43
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	63
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	52
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	41
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?

The lowest 25%ile students achieving learning gains in Math was our lowest performing area (33%). This was down from 44% in 2019.

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

The Middle School Acceleration cohort was our greatest decline from 2019 (-32 points). However, the percentage of students achieving learning gains in Math is considered an area of greater need, as the cohort is much larger. The learning gains of this group was 40%, down from 62% in 2019.

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

Decreases in teacher allocation resulted in a reduction of instructional time for Algebra. COVID 19 is also a contributing factor, due to a high percentage of students receiving online instruction.

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

None of the components showed an improvement. The area with the least decline was learning gains of the lowest 25%ile in ELA (-2%).

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

Contributing factors include increased emphasis on standards based instruction, along with veteran teachers.

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

Strategies to be implemented include increased emphasis on tiered interventions in all grade levels for reading instruction, an increase of instructional time for math, and renewed focus on the instructional design process.

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.

Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention for Tier 2 and Tier 3 in K - 5
Writing Revolution for teachers of middle school Level 1 students in ELA
Training on newly adopted Benchmark Advance and Savvas My Perspective texts

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

Implementation of Leveled Literacy Intervention in grades K - 5

Implementation, with fidelity, of Benchmark Advance series in K - 5

In depth PD addressing B.E.S.T. standards according to transition timeline

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 2 points, from 39% in 2019 to 37%. The scores in 2019 reflected a drop of 12% from the prior year.

Measurable Outcome:

During the 2021-22 school year, general education teachers, as well as teachers of students with disabilities, will participate in focused 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).

Monitoring:

CLP implementation will be monitored for fidelity across all levels. The CLP Cycle includes a data protocol for monitoring of Unit Assessments and iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Benchmark Advance grades K-5
Leveled Literacy Intervention Tier 2 and Tier 3, grades K - 5
Savvas My Perspective grades 6-8
Intensive Reading courses in grades 6-8 taught by Reading Interventionist
The Writing Revolution grades 6-8

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, standards-based instruction.
2. Provide access to professional development regarding new textbook adoptions and supplemental resources.
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)

Provide access to professional development regarding new textbook adoptions and supplemental resources.

Person Responsible

Diana Lankow (diana.lankow@stlucieschools.org)

Utilize District supports available through Office of Teaching and Learning.

Person Responsible

Glenn Rustay (glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org)

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:	The rationale for this focus is a decline of 11 ppoints in our percentage of stuents in the lowest 25% for Math. from 44% in 2019 to 33%. 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 2021-22 school year, general education and teachers of students with disabilities will participate in Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) meetings with their respected teams/grades, focusing on quality student work. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons utilizing the best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will result in a 17 point increase in Math for the Lowest 25%ile (including SWD), as measured by FSA.
Monitoring:	CLP implementation will be monitored for fidelity across all levels. The CLP Cycle includes a data protocol for monitoring of Unit Assessments and iReady.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mehgan Drost (mehgan.drost@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Quality instruction has the largest positive impact on student's achievement. Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction, in small groups, to increase achievement 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

Teachers will analyze student data to identify their lowest 25%ile, SWD, near proficiency, and fragile students.

Person Responsible Mehgan Drost (mehgan.drost@stlucieschools.org)

Math coach and instructional coach will instruct and model for teachers the SLPS math routine with fidelity and how to implement differentiated instruction with the math routine.

Person Responsible Ahmed Hussein (ahmed.hussein@stlucieschools.org)

Teachers will learn how to utilize Khan Academy and iReady instructional modules for whole group/small group instruction, centers, and homework.

Person Responsible Ahmed Hussein (ahmed.hussein@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the transition from Florida Standards in ELA to the B.E.S.T. standards. The rationale is to ensure student instruction in K - 2 embraces the new standards.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, teachers in grades K - 2, including teachers of students with disabilities, will instruct ELA using the B.E.S.T. standards, as measured by frequent instructional walkthroughs and observation.

Monitoring: Administration will conduct reading rounds each week, and instructional coaches will conduct walkthroughs as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Benchmark Advance grades K-5, newly adopted reading series
Intensive Reading courses in grades 6-8 taught by Reading Interventionist using new B.E.S.T. standards.

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

Provide access to professional development on B.E.S.T. standards, data-driven instruction, and standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Provide access to professional development regarding new textbook adoptions and supplemental resources.

Person Responsible Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

2. Utilize District supports available through Office of Teaching and Learning.

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

Facilitate Collaborative learning/planning to address quality student work.

Person Responsible Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA.
Description and Rationale:	Identified grades are as follows: Third grade 43% proficient, fourth grade 41% proficient, fifth grade 38% proficient
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2022, 51% students in grades 3,4,and 5 will show proficiency in ELA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, K-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan) - Use Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. - Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. - Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group – using monitoring schools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments).

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

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention

Person Responsible Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback

Person Responsible Diana Lankow (diana.lankow@stlucieschools.org)

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.

According to the data on SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Northport ranks 270 out of 313 combination schools statewide. Northport averaged 3 incidents per 100 students which falls into the "very high" category. The data shows the number of violent incidents reported is considered in the "very high" range as well; Northport ranked 274 out of 313 combination schools in the state for violent incidents. Fighting was the most reported violent incident, followed by sexual harassment, physical attack, and battery. While Northport K - 8 is currently in the very high category, the number of incidents per 100 students has steadily decreased from 2014 to 2019.

In order to continue the downward trend, the primary area of concern that we will monitor is Fighting; our secondary areas of concern are Physical Attack/Battery. One strategy we will continue to use is the implementation of SEL (Social Emotional Learning) strategies and lessons school-wide. Our MTSS:B Core Team will continue to meet monthly to analyze data, and then identify and target specific students and their needs. Our school-wide behavior technician will work with specific students for interventions, small group sessions, check-in/check-out, and mentoring. We will also utilize our school social worker and guidance counselors for small groups and interventions.

School culture and environment will be monitored through the use of Panorama Survey data, ODR data, and informal observations, and surveys of students, teachers, and staff.

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.

Northport K-8 has implemented Social and Emotional Learning into all classrooms using Sanford Harmony in VPK-5 classrooms and Lion's Quest curriculum in 6th-8th grade classrooms. All students on campus participate in daily circles, check-ins and activities geared toward developing the five competencies of SEL. With allotted time for SEL embedded into daily schedules, students and staff are immersed in activities that foster self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, decision-making, responsibility and build healthy relationship skills. SEL activities and competencies are built into staff meetings and meetings involving all stakeholders in the community, so that SEL becomes part of Northport's culture. Monthly faculty meetings begin with the reading aloud of "shout-outs" that are hand-written throughout the month celebrating fellow staff members. Monthly newsletters are forwarded to the staff with activities that are

focused on the SEL theme of the month. Northport K-8 has established a site-based SEL team that meets monthly to reflect on our school culture and environment, reviewing all available Panorama data, and focusing on our SEL strengths and areas in need of growth.

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

Northport's school-wide SEL team consists of administrators, teachers, behavior technicians, guidance counselors, instructional coaches and ESE teachers, all of whom are committed to fostering a positive school culture and environment focused on SEL. The team meets monthly to represent their respective areas in reporting and reflecting on SEL progress:

Glenn H. Rustay- Principal
 Meghan Drost- Assistant Principal
 Melody Nieves- Instructional Coach (SEL Cohort and K-8 SEL Coach- weekly fidelity checks of SEL curriculum)
 Heriberto Nieves- School-wide behavior interventionist (mentoring students with daily check-ins/check-outs)
 Lorena Wilson- Instructional Coach (Monitoring K-2 classrooms for SEL fidelity)
 Heath Curl- ESE teacher (Supporting circles and SEL activities in middle school classrooms)
 Elizabeth Butterworth- Graduation Coach
 Elisabet Flores- Middle School Teacher (Implementing Lion's Quest curriculum with all Northstars)
 Beth Dickinson- Middle School Guidance Counselor
 Diane Crumpton- Elementary Guidance Counselor
 Herenta Evoumwan- ESE Chair
 Alexis Pryde-Rodriguez- 2nd Grade Teacher
 Rosa Apostolico- 3rd grade enrichment teacher

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00