Northside Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Northside Elementary School

2001 NORTHSIDE DR, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lora Frowert

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2021

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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

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

Northside Elementary School

2001 NORTHSIDE DR, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**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	49%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

A collaborative focus on every student every day.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Frowert, Lora	Principal	
Pena, Angela	Assistant Principal	
Nixon , Kaitlin	Teacher, K-12	
Nield, Marcy	Teacher, K-12	
Campbell, Jamie	School Counselor	
Peters, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Ensminger, Katrina	Teacher, K-12	
Cooper, Nina	Teacher, K-12	
Simmons, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Howard, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Swearingen, Adrianna	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/6/2021, Lora Frowert

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

636

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

13

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

10

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	86	123	105	94	89	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	10	29	31	25	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	9	6	8	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	5	19	9	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	4	12	13	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	29	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	12	7	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
	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	7	18	15	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	6	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/18/2021

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	4	4	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	4	4	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				62%	55%	57%	56%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	59%	58%	51%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	57%	53%	35%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				57%	56%	63%	52%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	54%	62%	49%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	42%	51%	35%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	53%	53%	43%	50%	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	59%	61%	-2%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	59%	-7%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Spring NWEA MAP Assessment % of proficiency

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			63/123 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged			44/78 56%
	Students With Disabilities			6/17 35%
	English Language Learners			6/18 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			88/123 72%
	Economically Disadvantaged			54/78 69%
	Students With Disabilities			9/17 53%
	English Language Learners			10/18 56%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			54/114 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged			17/76 22%
	Students With Disabilities			8/25 32%
	English Language Learners			1/14 7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			48/114 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged			29/76 38%
	Students With Disabilities			8/25 32%
	English Language Learners			1/13 8%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			49/90 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged			22/63 35%
	Students With Disabilities			7/15 47%
	English Language Learners			1/8 13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			32/91 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged			16/63 30%
	Students With Disabilities			5/15 33%
	English Language Learners			2/9 22%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			46/95 48%
	Economically Disadvantaged			34/65 52%
	Students With Disabilities			9/18 50%
	English Language Learners			2/9 22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			35/95 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged			22/65 34%
	Students With Disabilities			7/18 39%
	English Language Learners			4/9 44%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			55/97 57%
	Economically Disadvantaged			30/66 45%
	Students With Disabilities			6/19 32%
	English Language Learners			2/5 40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			49/97 51%
	Economically Disadvantaged			29/66 44%
	Students With Disabilities			7/19 37%
	English Language Learners			2/5 40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			64/97 66%
	Economically Disadvantaged			34/66 52%
	Students With Disabilities			9/18 50%
	English Language Learners			0/5 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	27	35		39	35		31				
ELL	18			36							
BLK	34	50		39	38		38				
HSP	24	25		39	50		25				
MUL	50	40		54	40		30				
WHT	57	47		62	59		56				
FRL	41	39	46	49	44	46	44				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	57	66	53	45	57	53	45				
ELL	42	64		47	64						
BLK	28	50	50	25	38	45	17				
HSP	39	59	70	48	64						
MUL	53	45		47	55						
WHT	76	72		68	66	58	71				
FRL	59	64	61	54	56	53	47				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	34	34	43	32	33	33	11				
ELL	29	20		24							
BLK	30	38	23	18	34	43	10				
HSP	44	39	17	47	43		29				
MUL	50	36		75	55						
WHT	65	58	61	58	54	22	52				
FRL	52	49	32	46	46	33	43				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
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	40
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	35
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	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	56
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	44
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?

Decrease across all grade levels in ELA proficiency.

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

Although we saw an overall decrease in all subgroups our SWD and ELL students are the lowest score subgroups.

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

3rd Grade ELA proficiency decreased 20%. We believe the distrubtion in school from the hurricane and COVID closures created gaps in the students learning. In order to close those gaps, we will restructure our enrichment/intervention time to increase student achievement. We will utilize iReady and individualized lessons in order to provide instruction at the students' current levels.

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

We saw a decrease in all areas, but the math data showed the lowest decrease.

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

Consistency in curriculum made supporting our students during closures. Students math instruction is supported with the use of Zearn, which allows students to have daily practice with the standards they need more support with.

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

iReady will be utilized with fidelity. PLCs will actively track student data in order to plan instruction and problem solve.

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 iReady training 3 times throughout the 21-22 school year. All teachers participated in a re-establishing expectations which included in-depth refresher of MTSS procedures.

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

After school tutoring for studetns not showing adequate progress on iReady diagnostics.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Northside Elementary will increase the number of students making learning gains and demonstrating proficiency in ELA by planning, preparing and implementing targeted differentiated instruction that meets the intent and rigor of the standards. The Florida State Assessment measures students' ability to demonstrate mastery of state standards in ELA. Students scoring a Level 3 or above are considered to meet grade level mastery of state standards measured on the FSA. Based on the current released data 28% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 33% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 61% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency. Based on the released data 26% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 33% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 59% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency. Based on the released data 28% of tested fifth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 24% of tested fifth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 61% of tested fifth grade students scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency levels will increase 8% as measured on the 2022 FSA
Monitoring:	iReady diagnostic assessment will be given 3 times per year, D/F reports will be pulled twice a nine weeks, PLC data discussions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lora Frowert (frowelr@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards aligned targeted Tier I instruction utilizing high quality text and providing additional individualized supports at Tier II and III. Bay County has adopted a new state approved ELA Curriculum , Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, which is correlated with the new FL BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction on the new BEST standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. In addition the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade level texts to be accessible to all learners. In addition, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons for ELL students allowing them to access and interact with grade level texts and skills as well. Along with the implementation of the HMH curriculum, students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall, Winter and Spring. This diagnostic data will be used to identify students that need additional support and interventions. In addition students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits. Students will participate in growth monitoring assessments more frequently in order to determine student progress and needs.
Rationale for Evidence-	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Into Reading core adopted instructional materials for K-5 English Language Arts. The series was reviewed and approved by the FLDOE for inclusion on the State Adopted List at time of adoption and purchase. To improve instruction and learning,

based Strategy:	BDS teachers incorporate explicit, direct instruction (effect size of .60) adn scaffolding (effect size of. 82) based on Hattie's research (Visible Learning: John Hattie 2017)

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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

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

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Northside Elementary School will implement 15 minutes of daily Character Education in order to decrease student discipline referrals by 5%. Implementing character education daily will teach behavior expectations and how to appropriately respond to tough situations.
Measurable Outcome:	Effective instruction in character education will lead to a decrease of discipline incidents by 5%
Monitoring:	Monthy data chats, classroom walk-throughs focused on morning meetings, review of promise room data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Pena (penaac@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective instruction in character education will lead to a decrease of discipline incidents by 5%
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers embed character education into their instruction, the classroom becomes a more caring, respectful, and inclusive community.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible	Adrianna Swearingen (krebsam@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

The discipline data shows that our total reported suspensions per 100 students during 2019-20 are very high in comparison to other Florida elementary schools. The data also shows a decrease in the total reported suspensions from the 18-19 school year.

Northside will continue to have monthly data chats to discuss trends in behavior data. Teachers will participate in PD focusing on proactive strategies. All classrooms are supplied with calm down tools for students. We will also track lost instructional time.

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.

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

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

School staff collaborates with members of the Triad Team as well as outside resources (social workers, behavior interventionist, Florida Therapy counselors, Anchorage Children's Home, Elevate Bay and other community partners) to discuss coordination, implementation, and efficiency of services and works to identify new strategies or resources to benefit our students.

All faculty and staff use core essentials to support the school culture and build relationships with students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00

https://www.floridacims.org