
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	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Navy Point Elementary School

1321 PATTON DR, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: **Monica Ford Harris C**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia 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	24

Navy Point Elementary School

1321 PATTON DR, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

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 PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Navy Point Elementary's mission is to cultivate a school community where all members of the community will work together to motivate students to develop into successful learners, good citizens, and future leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Navy Point Elementary's school vision is to create a school where parents want to send their children, students want to learn, teachers want to teach and employees want to work. We want to be the school where "Excellence Takes Flight!"

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
Ford-Harris, Monica	Principal	The Principal's duty will be ensure that all goals are actively being targeted through identified instructional practices and regular progress monitored. She will work to disaggregate data and support teachers in identifying the needed remediation and enrichment activities that focus on student achievement. Her duties will also include holding data chats with students to set goals and to reflect on their own progress towards the end of year goals. She will be responsible for sharing out data related to science.
Taylor, Mat	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal's duties will include supporting teams as they work through the day to day instruction. He will regularly monitor and provide feedback to teachers regarding their progress towards meeting the identified goals. In addition, he will work share out data and progress with the team towards reaching the math goal.
White, Kanisha	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Coordinator's duties will include supporting teams as they work through the day to day instruction. She will plan weekly with the ELA teachers and be provide their on campus coaching support. She will regularly monitor and provide feedback to teachers regarding their progress towards meeting the identified goals. In addition, she will share out data and progress with the team towards reaching the ELA goal.
Garner, Latris	Other	The RTI/MTSS Coordinator's duties will be to meet with team and families to determine the most effective interventions for student success. She will assist K-2 teachers primarily with additional resources and supports needed for small group instruction. She will review the data for K-2 to help guide them with effectively implementing the RTI/MTSS system. In addition, she will report out to the team on progress towards meeting the writing goal and behavior goals.
Crisher, Hope	Teacher, K-12	The K-12 Teacher's duties will be to help monitor the school's progress towards meeting all academic goals. She will be provide input/suggestions on how to improve the overall performance of the school based on STAR and iReady data that is shared.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Monica Ford Harris C

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

411

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

6

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

5

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	67	68	48	65	55	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	10	40	19	26	25	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	7	6	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	47	20	21	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	5	5	9	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	4	13	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

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	38	83	69	57	71	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	13	28	22	17	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	4	7	3	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	6	2	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	14	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	38	83	69	57	71	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	13	28	22	17	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	4	7	3	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	6	2	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	14	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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				42%	53%	57%	30%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	55%	58%	32%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	52%	53%	39%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				41%	57%	63%	31%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	60%	62%	35%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	52%	51%	26%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				38%	54%	53%	39%	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	46%	56%	-10%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	51%	-24%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	35%	58%	-23%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	26%	55%	-29%	60%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	55%	-23%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter, and Spring ELA and Math progress monitoring. The science district quarterly assessment was used for science progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both survey 2 and 3.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15/27%	21/32%	23/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/26%	16/35%	13/28%
	Students With Disabilities	3/50%	4/44%	2/22%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	2/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18/33%	21/33%	24/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/28%	14/31%	17/38%
	Students With Disabilities	2/40%	2/25%	4/44%
	English Language Learners	1/20%	1/20%	2/40%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11/18%	16/26%	20/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/16%	11/23%	14/30%
	Students With Disabilities	1/13%	0/0%	1/13%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/13%	10/17%	11/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/14%	7/15%	6/13%
	Students With Disabilities	1/13%	0/0%	1/13%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/20%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6/15%	15/36%	14/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/16%	8/35%	9/45%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	0/0%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/14%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/13%	12/30%	13/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/11%	6/27%	8/40%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/17%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	2/15%	3/50%	3/38%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14/28%	17/31%	17/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/21%	9/25%	7/20%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	3/38%	3/38%
	English Language Learners	1/17%	1/17%	1/17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/29%	14/26%	18/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/26%	6/17%	11/31%
	Students With Disabilities	1/13%	1/13%	2/25%
	English Language Learners	2/33%	2/33%	2/33%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8/14%	12/19%	9/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/7%	6/14%	4/9%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	2/13%	1/6%
	English Language Learners	1/20%	1/25%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/21%	9/15%	10/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/19%	6/14%	5/11%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	1/7%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/20%	0/0%	1/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	7/12%	12/20%	15/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/9%	6/14%	7/17%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/6%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/25%

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	42	10		36	15		33				
ELL	24			35							
BLK	24	10		18	3		20				
HSP	38	27		26	18		27				
MUL	36			21							
WHT	51	38		42	38		65				
FRL	31	22	42	24	10	15	30				
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	35	32		33	55	50	46				
ELL	43	50		26	57		18				
BLK	31	49	50	30	40	41	32				
HSP	55	60		43	68		39				
WHT	44	53		51	65		41				
FRL	40	49	54	37	51	50	40				
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	33	43	31	29	32	13	33				
ELL	35	50		20	29						
BLK	22	26	23	24	31	28	36				
HSP	30	43	50	28	29		38				
MUL	21	10		36	40						
WHT	39	36		39	38		53				
FRL	24	31	43	29	35	24	33				

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	244
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	13
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	31
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	29
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	47
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	25
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Navy Point has demonstrated a downward move based on the FSA ELA data. We were at 30% proficiency in 2019 and down to 26% in 2021. The math proficiency also demonstrated a decrease in proficiency numbers 41% in 2019 to 27% in 2021. Science also demonstrated a decrease in proficiency numbers 38% in 2019 to 26% in 2021.

All sub-groups demonstrated a significant decrease in meeting the expected achievement levels from 2019 to 2021.

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

As noted above there were significant declines in proficiency numbers from the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment and FCAT Science as compared to the 2021 assessment data. These numbers are also reflective of what occurred with both the learning gains and lower 25% learning gains.

ELA learning gains decreased from 53% in 2019 to 15% in 2021
 ELA lower 25% learning gains also decreased from 53% in 2019 to 27% in 2021
 Math learning gains decreased from 56% in 2019 to 22% in 2021
 Math lower 25% learning gains also decreased from 56% in 2019 to 8% in 2021

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

During the 2020-2021 school year, Navy Point had 2-3 teachers resign for various reasons. We also had the challenge of COVID that lead to virtual and remote learning options. Teachers struggled to keep students online all day and several students did not attend virtually nor remotely for weeks at a time. Navy Point also had to quarantine many times throughout the year, which lead to lost of instruction.

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

Unfortunately, Navy Point has to report that we decreased in all subject area achievement cells, as well as reported sub-groups cells. We have a plan to remediate and intervene on students as quickly as possible during the 2021-2022 school year to work towards improving our data as evident by the Florida Standards Assessment and FCAT Science Assessment.

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

The virtual and remote options are no longer in place for families. All students are coming into the building for instruction. We have hired additional positions to help target the intervention needs of students. We are starting fully staff with K-5 teachers. In addition multiple tutoring opportunities are being offered to students throughout the year to help with remediation needs.

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

Navy Point will be implementing after-school tutoring opportunities for all K-5 students. We will of course encourage our more vulnerable population of students to attend. Additional support positions have been added to help with intervention and remediation needs. Teachers are implementing targeted small group instruction, in addition to the ELA intervention block.

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.

Teachers will participate in on-going iReady professional development sessions throughout the year. Math teachers will receive support and PD opportunities through our contract with The Southern Regional Education Board. Teachers will also participate in sharing opportunities regarding their data and problem-solve strategies to help one another by sharing effective instructional practices.

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

Navy Point currently has an active contract with The Southern Regional Education Board for math support. We plan to continue funding the additional personnel that prove to be effective in moving the student achievement data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Writing

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Achievement in ELA has not reached 48% proficiency in all subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged (20%), Students with Disabilities (20%), Black (13%), and White (47%).
(FSA scores, STAR Scores, classroom walkthroughs, and IReady Scores)

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency will go from 26% on the 2021 FSA to 40% or higher on the 2022 FSA which includes all subgroups. The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 20% on the 2021 ELA FSA to 39% or higher on the 2022 ELA FSA.

(Students will show an increase in proficiency on school-wide writing scores from Quarter 1 to Quarter 4.)

Monitoring: Classroom teachers will administer quarterly writing assessments. Teachers will provide individualized feedback to students using the district-provided rubric.

Quarterly writing prompts in grades KG-5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdf.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will learn strategies for planning, revising, and editing written work to make targeted improvements.
With specific writing goals students will demonstrate proficiency using a writing rubric.

Feedback and rubric scores on writing prompt from the writing committee

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Writing conferencing is a one on one direct strategy designed to guide and assist students through the writing process. The purpose is to unlock a writer's potential by guiding them toward proficiency using a specific rubric.

To improve student's writing abilities in grades KG-5.

Evidence-based Strategy: Writing prompts to be given quarterly by classroom teachers and scored by the writing committee using the Building Better Writers Rubric
Progress monitor, conference, and set goals with students

Action Steps to Implement

- Create and implement a quarterly writing prompt calendar
- Review rubric and expectations with the committee and classroom teachers
- Quarterly meeting with the committee and teachers
- Attend monthly district offered Literacy Rep Training on how to implement the ELA Curriculum effectively.
- District coaching support as needed to provide writing interventions to increase teacher efficacy.
- Bi-Weekly student conference/feedback sessions on classroom writing samples.

Person Responsible Latris Garner (lgarner@ecsdf.us)

Navy Point will work to form a school-wide writing committee
School administrators will conduct daily walkthroughs and will review school-wide data twice a month.

Person Responsible Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdf.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Navy Point's math proficiency has demonstrated a decreased based on the Florida Standards Assessment. Proficiency was 41% in 2019 and decreased to 27% in 2021. Our math learning gains also demonstrated a decrease from 56% in 2019 to 22% in 2021, as well as the math lower 25% learning gains from 56% in 2019 to 8% in 2021.</p> <p>The proficiency percentages for the subgroups are as follow: SWD decreased from 33% in 2019 to 20% in 2021, African-Americans decreased from 30% to 19%, Hispanics decreased from 43% to 26%, Whites decreased from 51% to 36%, and economically disadvantaged students decreased from 37% to 20%.</p>
	<p>Navy Point will increase the math proficiency number from 27% in 2021 to 40% or higher as measured by the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>The math learning gain percentage will be increased from 22% in 2021 to 50% or higher as measured by the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.</p> <p>The math lower 25% learning gain percentage will be increased from 8% to 50% or higher as measured by the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Navy Point's administrative team will pull weekly i-Ready math reports to review and provide teachers feedback. Teachers will administer mid-point topic probes that are developed by the district Math Department for progress monitoring of students on the current standards being taught. We will also use the topic assessment data to monitor students' need for reteaching of standards not mastered. The quarterly STAR assessment will be used as the school's benchmark assessment to measure students' progress towards the end of year FSA math goal.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Mat Taylor (mtaylor3@ecsdfl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Navy Point will be using i-Ready daily lessons for regular monitoring of progress. i-Ready reteach lessons will be used to remediate standards not yet mastered. The HMH series provides a reteach component that will also be used for remediation. Those students who are in need of enrichment activities will use the study buddy component for independent work.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The iReady tools, as well as the HMH are aligned to the current standards that will be assessed on FSA. They offer research based resources that are proven effective for remediation and enrichment needs. Teachers are able to adjust the lessons based on the targeted standards for remediation or reteaching as needed.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Navy Point implements the departmentalization model at grades 2-5. This allows for targeted instructional support by content area. The math teachers will meet weekly with the Assistant Principal and Teacher on Special Assignment from the District Math Department for planning and data discussion. The planning sessions allow for cross grade-level collaboration.

Daily walks are completed with specific focus related to continuous improvement. The feedback provided to teachers is to help support their professional development. Navy Point's administrative team will also complete monthly walks with a representative from The Southern Regional Education Board. This team works closely with the school to improve instructional practices within the math content. There are follow

up PLCs held immediately following the walks based on the observation notes and the school's walkthrough data.

Person Responsible Mat Taylor (mtaylor3@ecsdfi.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Navy Point's overall proficiency rate based on the Florida Standards ELA Assessment decreased from the 2019 FSA assessment (42%) as compared to the 2021 FSA ELA Reading Assessment (31%).

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on the 2021 End of Year STAR Reading progress monitoring assessment Navy Point's proficiency rates were as follow: Kindergarten 19%, 1st grade 27%, and 2nd grade 18%.

Based on the 2021 Florida Standards ELA Assessment, Navy Point's proficiency rates were as follow: 3rd grade 38%, 4th grade 38%, and 5th grade 20%.

Navy Point's ESSA proficiency rates are as follow based on the 2021 Florida Standards ELA Assessment: Economically Disadvantage 20%, ELL 6%, African American 13%, Hispanic 24%, Multiracial 36%, and White 47%.

ELA proficiency will increase from 31% to 50% or higher based on the 2022 FSA data. ELA learning gains will increase from 15% on the 2021 FSA to 41% or higher based on the 2022 FSA data.

Navy Point will increase proficiency rates based on the 2022 End of Year STAR Reading progress monitoring assessment as follow: Kindergarten 40% or higher, 1st grade 50% or higher, and 2nd grade 40%.

Measurable Outcome:

Navy Point will increase proficiency rates based on the 2022 Florida Standards ELA Assessment as follow: 3rd grade 47% or higher, 4th grade 50% or higher, and 5th grade 45% or higher.

Navy Point will increase the ESSA proficiency rates as follow based on the 2022 Florida Standards ELA Assessment: Economically Disadvantage 41% or higher, ELL 41% or higher, African American 41% or higher, Hispanic 41% or higher, Multiracial 41% or higher, and White 55% or higher.

Monitoring:

Navy Point's administrative team will pull weekly iReady and AR reading reports to review and provide teachers feedback. Teachers will administer mid-point assessments that are developed by the district ELA Department for progress monitoring of students on the current standards being taught. We will also use the module assessment data to monitor students' need for reteaching of standards not mastered. The quarterly STAR assessment will be used as the school's benchmark assessment to measure students' progress towards the end of year reading goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kanisha White (kwhite3@ecsdf.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Navy Point will be using iReady daily lessons for regular monitoring of progress. iReady reteach lessons will be used to remediate standards not yet mastered. The HMH series provides a reteach component that will also be used for remediation. Teachers will use the mid-module assessment, as well as the module assessments for think alouds to help students understand and correct their misconceptions.

Accelerated Reader is a tool that is used to help increase students' vocabulary and reading comprehension skills. It is proven to help improve students reading levels when used and

monitored to fidelity.

Beverly Tyner Small Group Differentiated Instruction, Phonics Chip Kit Lessons by 95% Group and the Souday Systems 1 will be used to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Navy Point implements the departmentalization model at grades 2-5. This allows for targeted instructional support by content area. The ELA teachers will meet weekly with the Curriculum Coordinator for planning and data discussion. The planning sessions allow for cross grade-level collaboration.

Daily walks are completed with specific focus related to continuous improvement. The feedback provided to teachers is to help support their professional development and improved instruction.

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.

N/A

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.

Grade-levels/departments will meet weekly to discuss planning and support needs

Hospitality team will have activities throughout the year.

ex. Shoutout board where faculty can be recognized for anything. Each month, two names from the board will be drawn to win a prize.

The school will be contracting with Children's Home Society to provide a social worker 5 days a week to Navy Point Elementary School. The purpose of the social worker (which the school will call Navigators) will be to identify and assess family needs; to guide and inform families of available community resources; and to coordinate access to health and human services, educational and other family support systems (i.e. Food Stamps, financial assistance, etc).

Administration will provide consistent feedback and support.

The school will also provide a mental health counselor through their mental health allocation 3 days a week and a guidance counselor 5 days a week. The counselors will be working with students one on one and in small groups to provide counseling and mental health support. They will also be able to facilitate and assist families with parenting skills, family support, understanding child and adolescent development, and setting home conditions that support learning at each age and grade level.

Navy Point Elementary School will run a clothing closet on campus. The purpose of the clothing closet is to provide new and gently worn clean clothes for students. This will include new underwear, socks, shoes and backpacks for students in need, as identified by the Navigator and or school staff.

Navy Point Elementary School will also continue to implement a structured PBIS plan that will be monitored through PBIS Rewards, RtIB, and the FOCUS student information system. Behavior data is monitored by the administration, guidance, and PBIS team.

Navy Point Elementary School will utilize Suite 360 for character education. Through the use of Suite 360 teachers and students will work on lessons that help set goals for behavior and teach students strategies to work through conflict resolution.

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

Administration - consistent discipline, model behaviors we want to see, build positive relationships with students, faculty, and families.

PBIS team - encourage and promote positive behavior

Counselors (guidance and mental health) - working with the social and emotional growth of our students.

Teachers - classroom management, student engagement, family involvement.

Office staff - welcoming, helpful, and clear communication with visitors, families, and other faculty.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Writing	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00