

Columbia County School District

Niblack Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Niblack Elementary School

837 NE BROADWAY AVE, Lake City, FL 32055

<http://nes.columbiak12.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Kaeutonia Murphy

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2000

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| 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 Columbia 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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Niblack Elementary School

837 NE BROADWAY AVE, Lake City, FL 32055

<http://nes.columbiak12.com/>

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 | 95% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Columbia 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.

Our mission at Niblack Elementary School is to provide a learning experience that will allow our students to excel in all areas of life. We aim for an atmosphere of cooperation, with respect for individual differences that is conducive to success. We strive for active engagement from our parents, teachers, staff and community members.

The school's mission and vision statement is communicated with parents through monthly newsletters, the website, and also it is shared at the Open House visit for the school year. This information is posted in every classroom, as well as in the front office.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Niblack Elementary School, we are committed to the academic, physical and social development of our students.

We are a community school that strives to create a union among staff, students, parents, community members, and business partners that will ensure quality education for the students we serve.

We expect all of our students to achieve and maintain high educational standards.

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 |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ivery, Nakitha | Principal | She is responsible for financial operations, building maintenance, student scheduling, personnel, public relations, school policy regarding discipline, coordination of the instructional program and other overall school matters. |
| Sanders, Tracy | Behavior Specialist | She provides intervention and instruction to assist at-risk students to develop appropriate behavior, coping skills and social skills. She plans and uses appropriate learning skills, activities, and materials that meet the needs of the students. |
| James, Nancy | Curriculum Resource Teacher | She is responsible for providing curriculum support systems for students, teachers and parents. Assist the classroom teacher and provide additional support for children with moderate learning difficulties. |
| Symonette, Violet | Instructional Coach | She serves as part of the Leadership Team and is responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity. |
| Bicknell, Terri | School Counselor | Her responsibilities include offering counseling to students or teachers, conducting group counseling sessions to help students develop their personal and academic skills and providing career advice and guidance to students. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/21/2000, Kaeutonia Murphy

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.*

4

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

288

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

3

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

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 59 | 59 | 32 | 41 | 34 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 18 | 18 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 9 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

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 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

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 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/6/2021

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 | 61 | 42 | 39 | 35 | 42 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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 | 61 | 42 | 39 | 35 | 42 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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 | | | | 39% | 60% | 57% | 39% | 53% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 46% | 60% | 58% | 42% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56% | 67% | 53% | 50% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 51% | 66% | 63% | 60% | 67% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 59% | 61% | 62% | 58% | 63% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47% | 50% | 51% | 59% | 57% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 28% | 55% | 53% | 31% | 57% | 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 | 33% | 68% | -35% | 58% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 62% | -21% | 58% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 29% | 59% | -30% | 56% | -27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 70% | -26% | 62% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 64% | -2% | 64% | -2% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 65% | -30% | 60% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 23% | 59% | -36% | 53% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used is iReady for ELA and Math. The progress monitoring tool used for Science is performance matters.

| | | Grade 1 | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 38 | 54 | 68 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 38 | 54 | 68 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | | |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 16 | 40 | 68 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 16 | 40 | 68 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | | |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 43 | 42 | 69 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 42 | 69 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 13 | 45 | 69 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 45 | 69 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 40 | 47 | 53 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40 | 47 | 53 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 0 | 25 | 41 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 25 | 41 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 42 | 39 | 54 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 42 | 39 | 54 |
| | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 6 | 29 | 69 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6 | 29 | 69 |
| | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 16 | 13 | 31 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 | 13 | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12 | 32 | 60 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 32 | 60 |
| | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 13 | 20 | 50 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 20 | 50 |
| | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

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 | 9 | 33 | | 26 | 50 | | 14 | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 54 | | 51 | 60 | | 16 | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 41 | 50 | 46 | 56 | | 10 | | | | |
| 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 | 43 | | 39 | 57 | | 33 | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 45 | 57 | 49 | 57 | 47 | 21 | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 43 | 56 | 47 | 59 | 43 | 26 | | | | |
| 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 | 37 | 44 | | 37 | 31 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 39 | 47 | 60 | 58 | 56 | 31 | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 41 | 50 | 59 | 57 | 59 | 27 | | | | |

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 | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 265 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 26 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 45 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 40 |
| 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?

According to our FSA data, the trends for grades 3, 4, and 5 is that ELA is lower than Math. Third grade ELA was 28% and Math 35%. In fourth grade ELA was 67% and Math was 73%. In fifth grade ELA was 41% and Math was 55%. ELA is one of our primary area of focus. Improving reading performance is a school wide goal. In the subgroup category our black students are the lowest performing in ELA. Science being a core content area is our other primary area of focus. Science has been an area of focus for Niblack for the past 5 years.

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

For the 2019 grade component that showed the lowest component was Science Achievement. The Science achievement level was 28 percent. Also the ELA achievement level is an area of concern. The ELA achievement level was 39 percent. ELA and Science have been the lower achievement areas in previous years. In the subgroup category our black students are the lowest performing. In the area of ELA black students achievement was 21percent.

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

A few contributing factors include: new teachers in each grade level, students have limited vocabulary and language barriers. The new actions that will be taken to address this need for improvement will be to provide professional development for all teachers, implement small group differentiated instruction from teachers/tutors, and utilize iReady practice/lessons to allow students to work at their own pace on identified areas of weaknesses.

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

For the 2019 grade component that showed the most improvement was the ELA Achievement Gain in the bottom quartile. In 2018 the bottom quartile was 50 percent in achievement gains. In 2019, the bottom quartile was 56 percent in achievement gains.

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

The contributing factors that were implemented were intervention groups with the lowest quartile students. These students received 40 minutes of intervention in reading twice a week. Support staff pushed into the classes during reading times to help provide small group differentiated instruction based on student's needs. Tutors were also used to work with our bubble students in the area of ELA.

Tutors used the FOCUS materials to work with our bubble students on their identified benchmarks from the iReady program. Weekly classroom walkthroughs with feedback and suggestions from the lead team aide teachers in improving direct instruction. The BRT, CRT, and IC all assisted teachers in the areas that were noted from the walkthroughs. The lead team used a tiered intervention plan with teachers to strategically implement assistance where needed. The information gathered from walkthroughs and surveys from teachers was used to provide professional learning opportunities. Professional learning topics included student engagement, rigor, unpacking the standards/item specifications, collaboration, embedded writing, AR and iReady.

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

Strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning will be able to hire tutors that are retired teachers to assist to accelerate learning. Provide enrichment activities to students participating in the 21st Century after school program. The lead team will conduct walkthroughs during the ELA block and provide constructive feedback to teachers. ELA strategies such as UNRAVEL, summarizing, think aloud, QAR, and using graphic organizers will be used to accelerate learning in reading.

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

Professional development training with the LLI curriculum will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders. Professional development on unpacking the standards, the ELA Wonders curriculum, using and analyzing data, and the new upcoming BEST math standards.

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

The lead team will continue to assist teachers and provide assistance where needed. The lead team will push into tested grade levels for support. Support staff will offer assistance during the reading blocks by providing small group differentiated instruction. Closing The Achievement Gap (CTAG) tutors which are retired teachers will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement for the next year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing the 2021 FSA scores the overall area of focus are ELA, Math and Science. The proficiency for the ELA and Math was 42 and 49 percent. The percent of our students achieving proficiency is below the state average in ELA by 53 percent and 52 percent in Math. The Science score decreased by 14 percent so this is a focus area for the school as well. With low proficiency rates in ELA, Math, and Science, the focus for the school year will be on the tested subject areas.

Measurable Outcome: If all teachers provide high quality rigorous instruction aligned with subject area standards, then student achievement will increase by 3% in ELA, Math, and Science through differentiated instruction by implementing technology through the web based software and supplemental educational materials and supplies.

Monitoring: Monitoring will be done through progress monitoring assessments given throughout the year (3 times a year)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Violet Symonette (symonettev@columbiak12.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based strategies being implemented for this area of focus are: Metacognitive Strategies that clarify purpose for reading, preview text, monitor reading, adjust reading rate, and check understanding. Graphic organizers and semantic maps, question and answer relationship (QAR), recognizing story/text structure summarizing, and unravel.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence - based strategies listed above are recommended strategies through the Florida Reading Initiative. These strategies have been proven to increase reading achievement here at Niblack in previous years.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will partake in individualized instruction through Accelerated Reader, iReady ELA and Math, and Study Island

Person Responsible Nakitha Ivery (iveryn@columbiak12.com)

Teachers will utilize supplemental materials, LAFS, MAFS, Focus, Zoom In, and Read Works to meet students' individual needs.

Person Responsible Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.com)

Students will receive differentiated instruction from teachers, paraprofessionals, and tutors to work in small groups with students on targeted benchmarks.

Person Responsible Nakitha Ivery (iveryn@columbiak12.com)

Teachers will be provided with professional learning opportunities in all focus areas. Principal, Instructional Coach, CRT, and BRT will facilitate these professional opportunities to teachers

Person Responsible Violet Symonette (symonettev@columbiak12.com)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing the 2020-2021 parent involvement activities, the results showed poor parental involvement. Studies have shown that students who have some type of support system achieve better.

Measurable Outcome: If we increase family engagement at Niblack through providing opportunities for active engagement then students achievement will increase by 3% and discipline referrals will decrease 3%.

Monitoring: Monitoring will be done through parent participation though sign in sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategies being implemented for this area of focus are: frequent and positive communication with parents, create a welcoming environment, developing relationships with parents, and survey parents for interest of events to be offered.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research has shown that if parents are involved students will be more successful. These strategies have been utilized in previous years here at Niblack. In the past we have seen a positive correlation with parent involvement and students academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Curriculum nights (ELA, Math, Science) - We will provide families with grade appropriate information in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science. Students and parents will have opportunities to visit stations and engage in hands-on activities. Parents will receive innovative ways to make learning enjoyable.

Person Responsible Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.com)

SAC meetings - We will provide families and community members with information about initiatives to improve student achievement. We also allow them the opportunity to give input

Person Responsible Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.com)

Parent/family conferences - We will provide families the opportunity to meet their child's teacher and ask about their progress and receive strategies for home practice.

Person Responsible Vincent Flournoy (flournoyv@columbiak12.com)

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.

Looking at the discipline data the school leadership team will address other school wide priorities through discussions in weekly leadership meetings. Also, leadership team members meet weekly with each grade level during their planning period for common planning. During these meetings we address MTSS, attendance, discipline, data/academics, social and emotional concerns of students. We look at different subgroups of students and their performance. If we have any migrant students, we would discuss their progress as well during these meetings.

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.

Niblack Elementary builds a positive culture that is parent and family friendly by the use of positive communications, meaningful parent engagement activities, and parent conferences. We use newsletters, school messenger, social media, and welcome all visitors to build positive relationships with parents, family, and other community stakeholders. We help parents see the importance of education for their child.

Niblack offers opportunities for stakeholders to be included in the Title I Schoolwide Plan and the Parent and Family Engagement Plan by using School Advisory Council meetings for public input. Surveys are also utilized to solicit parent input. We also provide numerous opportunities for parents to attend events involving their students. These include but are not limited to, open house, meet the teacher, science night, reading nights, math nights, family fun nights, and cold read academy.

Our mission at Niblack Elementary School is to provide a learning experience that will allow our students to excel in all areas of life. We aim for an atmosphere of cooperation, with respect for individual differences that is conducive to success. We strive for active engagement from our parents, teachers, staff and community members.

The school's mission and vision statement is communicated with parents through monthly newsletters and the website. This information is posted in every classroom, as well as the front office.

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

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 are critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are also critical.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | | | \$268,093.37 |
|----------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|--------------|--------------|
| Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 | |
| 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$15,393.87 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Supplemental Instructional Materials & General Materials and supplies Curriculum Associates supplemental materials, classroom supplies ie. pencils, paper, staplers, chart paper, board cleaner, highlighters, STEM day activity supplies, etc, saxon phonics, handwriting books, mentoring minds supplemental materials,</i> | | | | |
| 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$4,631.71 | |
| | | <i>Notes: student recognition, classroom supplements,</i> | | | | |
| 5100 | 369-Technology-Related Rentals | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$13,357.00 | |
| | | <i>Notes: software licenses</i> | | | | |
| 6300 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$138,193.66 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Curriculum Resource Teacher and Behavior Resource Teacher</i> | | | | |
| 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$15,538.98 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Instructional Coach</i> | | | | |
| 5100 | 150-Aides | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$71,173.99 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Parapro salaries</i> | | | | |
| 5100 | 150-Aides | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$4,819.71 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Tutor salary & Social Security</i> | | | | |
| 5100 | 360-Rentals | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,800.00 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Copier</i> | | | | |
| 5100 | 519-Technology-Related Supplies | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$1,506.45 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Headphones and toner</i> | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | 6400 | 750-Other Personal Services | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$678.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: substitutes (teachers)</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | | | | \$13,877.22 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 6150 | 510-Supplies | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$6,920.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials and supplies to conduct parent and family engagement activities as well as engage parents in two way communication with the school.</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 150-Aides | 0161 - Niblack Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$6,957.22 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Parapro salary</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$281,970.59 |