North Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

North Elementary School

3000 NW 10TH TER, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://northelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

Demographics

Principal: Tuuli Robinson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Okeechobee County School Board on 10/5/2021.

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

North Elementary School

3000 NW 10TH TER, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://northelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.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 KG-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	50%

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 Okeechobee County School Board on 10/5/2021.

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.

North Elementary School will create a learning environment in which teachers and parents work together to enable each student to realize his/her potential. The school and its faculty will provide students with the best resources and instruction possible in order for them to be successful both in school, and later in life as thriving members of our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Achieving excellence - putting students first!
Through the national pandemic, NES is also following the recommendation of Compassion and Grace from the FLDOE in all decision making.

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
Robinson, Tuuli	Principal	School leadership - instructional leadership
Briney, Heather	Assistant Principal	Support school leadership - management and student support
Williams, Rachel	Reading Coach	Instructional support in Reading
Striebel, Myranda	Math Coach	Instructional support in Math
Emley, Jennifer	School Counselor	Student Support Services
Porter, Rachel	Other	MTSS planning and support, special education planning and support

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Tuuli Robinson

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

544

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

8

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

9

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	85	90	91	97	91	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	541
Attendance below 90 percent	36	40	30	25	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

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	82	88	84	95	87	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	82	88	84	95	87	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	30	17	25	18	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	17	16	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	14	9	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	9	4	6	9	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	52%	57%	59%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	54%	58%	43%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	55%	53%	33%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				71%	62%	63%	64%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	57%	62%	41%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	42%	51%	23%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	44%	53%	61%	54%	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	77%	59%	18%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	46%	4%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	50%	11%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	66%	4%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	44%	2%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math: iReady Diagnostic Assessments
Science: NWEA (no comparison data available for the 2020-2021 school year)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/1.2%	89/8.9%	90/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83/1.2%	89/8.9%	90/38%
	Students With Disabilities	20/0%	21/19%	22/32%
	English Language Learners	23/0%	26/0%	27/19%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	81/4%	89/10%	89/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81/4%	89/10%	89/30%
	Students With Disabilities	19/0%	21/5%	22/18%
	English Language Learners	23/0%	26/0%	27/15%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/11%	90/24%	91/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83/11%	90/24%	91/42%
	Students With Disabilities	8/0%	10/0%	11/27%
	English Language Learners	23/4%	26/4%	27/19%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84/0%	90/4%	90/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/0%	90/4%	90/24%
	Students With Disabilities	9/0%	10/0%	11/9%
	English Language Learners	24/0%	26/0%	27/11%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	97/15%	99/23%	97/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	97/15%	99/23%	97/39%
	Students With Disabilities	17/0%	17/6%	16/19%
	English Language Learners	15/0%	16/0%	16/6%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	97/2%	98/15%	98/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	97/2%	98/15%	98/41%
	Students With Disabilities	16/0%	17/6%	17/24%
	English Language Learners	16/0%	16/0%	16/19%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/19%	88/33%	90/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83/19%	88/33%	90/50%
	Students With Disabilities	14/0%	16/0%	16/6.25%
	English Language Learners	14/0%	15/13%	15/13%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/7%	88/20%	90/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83/7%	88/20%	90/34%
	Students With Disabilities	14/0%	16/0%	16/0%
	English Language Learners	14/0%	15/7%	15/7%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84/11%	87/13%	84/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/11%	87/13%	84/18%
	Students With Disabilities	26/8%	26/4%	26/12%
	English Language Learners	12/0%	13/0%	13/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84/8%	87/18%	85/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/8%	87/18%	85/29%
	Students With Disabilities	26/4%	26/8%	26/12%
	English Language Learners	12/0%	13/0%	13/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	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	27	35		29	13		26				
ELL	43	33	17	54	27	42	29				
BLK	27			45							
HSP	54	42	14	58	22	38	37				
WHT	61	38		60	21		33				
FRL	48	40	20	57	21	18	38				
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	47	44	56	49	48	33	25				
ELL	49	43	57	67	69	56	28				
BLK	47	61		42	61						
HSP	54	47	54	66	69	54	34				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	76	62	60	77	70	60	65				
FRL	56	54	63	63	60	47	39				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	47	41	36	45	27	19	42				
ELL	50	42	32	57	36	24	65				
BLK	62	33		52	15						
HSP	50	43	36	56	41	25	63				
WHT	66	46	31	72	44	22	61				
FRL	54	42	33	60	37	24	54				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	36
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
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	
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	43
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	35
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?

Using the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment data and as compared to the 2018-2019 data, NES saw a drop in the following areas:
- ELA proficiency in 3rd grade (from 77% to 57%)
- ELA proficiency in 5th grade (from 61% to 54%)
- Math proficiency in 4th grade (from 73% to 62%)
- Math proficiency in 5th grade (from 57% to 46%)
- Science proficiency (from 47% to 33%)

We saw a positive trend in 4th grade ELA and 3rd grade math performance overall. We also outperformed the district average in all areas but 5th grade science.
We outperformed the state average in 3rd grade ELA, 4th grade ELA, and tied for 5th grade ELA.
We outperformed the state average in 3rd grade math and 4th grade math.

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

5th grade ELA, math, and science

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

NES experienced a difficulty in instructional staffing, with the biggest impact in 5th grade (two brand new teachers, one teacher with one (1) year of teaching experience, one teacher moved in from special areas to teach ELA and SS, as well as one long term sub).
- There are no substitute teachers or non-certified teachers in 5th grade this year. All teachers have at least one year of teaching experience, and all teachers have teaching experience in 5th grade.

We experienced significant struggles with student behaviors in 5th grade in 2020-2021. Behavior management training in CHAMPS was implemented to support teachers.

Teacher support from the administrative team was not maximized due to the unique circumstances experienced at our school. In 2021-2022, we have secured an Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, as well as a Resources Specialist to support our school functions. We have a Resource Specialist who is now in her second year of employment. We have two coaches (1/2 position each) who can focus on teacher support in ELA and Math.

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

4th grade ELA and 3rd grade math

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

Student grouping, experienced teachers, students' behaviors.
No new actions were taken as we continued to utilize the available instructional materials and follow the instructional roadmaps from the district.

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

Follow the instructional maps with fidelity
Utilize frequent progress monitoring assessments to have good data to determine students' needs
Utilize the support of the instructional coaches to support teachers
- Reading coach is supporting ELA
- Math coach is supporting Math
- the Assistant Principal is supporting Science with an emphasized focus on 5th grade
Utilize a more frequent observation and feedback cycle by administrators to support teachers and improve instruction.
Improve home-school partnerships to support students' learning.
Incorporate SEL AVID strategies and to empower students to be more cognizant about their own learning, and take pride in their work.

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.

Program specific support:
- iReady instruction and assessment
- Data analysis and the writing of students' instructional support plans (MTSS)
Instructional strategies with focus on
- student engagement
- gradual release
- questioning
- formative assessment
- use of instructional materials
- alignment of the learning tasks with the instructional standards
- planning and preparation for quality instruction

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

NES will capitalize on the expertise of the leadership team, and allowing everyone to focus (in addition to the regular job duties) on one thin slice of staff support as follows:
- Reading coach - ELA support
- Math coach - Math support
- AP - Science support/behavior support
- Resource Specialist - ESE and MTSS support
- Principal - instructional coaching, progress monitoring and MTSS planning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Student Achievement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELA proficiency overall as well as among subgroups. Using the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment data and as compared to the 2018-2019 data, NES saw a drop in the following areas: - ELA proficiency in 3rd grade (from 77% to 57%) - ELA proficiency in 5th grade (from 61% to 54%)
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to see a 5% gain in proficiency in ELA across grade levels, compared to 2020 FSA data.
Monitoring:	- MTSS ELA Data Chats with instructional staff to triangulate data, and identify students' MTSS Tier needs in ELA - Quarterly grades review and analysis (revisit tier plans if needed) - Monitor growth on iReady diagnostic assessments - Utilize the APM assessment in fall and again in early spring to gauge students' progress on standardized assessment like test
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- provide standards based instruction, utilizing district approved instructional materials - frequent progress monitoring - interventions based on high impact strategies (select from Branching Minds) - reading coach supporting planning for instruction - quarterly revisiting MTSS Tier plans to re-examine students' needs for support
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When using high quality materials that support the teaching of instructional standards, students will have a better chance of performing well on standardized assessments. Proper planning and well thought out MTSS plans will further ensure high quality instruction, meeting individual students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Other specifically relating to Student Achievement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase math proficiency overall as well as among subgroups. Using the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment data and as compared to the 2018-2019 data, NES saw a drop in the following areas: - Math proficiency in 4th grade (from 73% to 62%) - Math proficiency in 5th grade (from 57% to 46%)
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to see a 5% gain in proficiency in Math across grade levels, compared to 2020 FSA data.
Monitoring:	- MTSS Math Data Chats with instructional staff to triangulate data, and identify students' MTSS Tier needs in Math - Quarterly grades review and analysis (revisit tier plans if needed) - Monitor growth on iReady diagnostic assessments - Utilize the APM assessment in fall and again in early spring to gauge students' progress on standardized assessment like test
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- provide standards based instruction, utilizing district approved instructional materials - frequent progress monitoring - interventions based on high impact strategies (select from Branching Minds) - math coach supporting planning for instruction - quarterly revisiting MTSS Tier plans to re-examine students' needs for support
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When using high quality materials that support the teaching of instructional standards, students will have a better chance of performing well on standardized assessments. Proper planning and well thought out MTSS plans will further ensure high quality instruction, meeting individual students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Other specifically relating to Student Achievement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Science proficiency overall as well as among subgroups. Using the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment data and as compared to the 2018-2019 data, NES saw a drop in the following areas: - Science proficiency (from 47% to 33%)
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to reach a 50% proficiency in 5th Grade Science on the 2021-2022 State Science Assessment.
Monitoring:	- Data chats with 5th grade teachers upon completion of the NWEA fall assessment - Quarterly grades review and analysis of supports needed - Assistant Principal will meet regularly with 5th grade Science teachers to support planning for good quality instruction - Utilize the NWEA assessment in fall and again in early spring to gauge students' progress on standardized assessment like test
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Briney (heather.johnson@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- provide standards based instruction, utilizing district approved instructional materials as well as science labs to expand learning opportunities - frequent progress monitoring (NWEA) - Assistant Principal supporting planning of science instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When using high quality materials that support the teaching of instructional standards, students will have a better chance of performing well on standardized assessments. Additional exposure to the science content in unique settings will help students with making sense of science. Proper planning will further ensure the delivery of high quality instruction, meeting all students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

NES experienced a spike in the number of reported discipline incidents; specifically in grades K and 5. We observed unique student populations and needs, stemming from the lack of early identification and intervention for school readiness in kindergarten, and an influx of new student population in 5th grade that greatly altered our existing school climate.
Monthly PBIS and MTSS A and B data chats will be held to have a good understanding of the discipline issues as well as academics across the campus. Interventions and support will be provided as appropriate.

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.

North Elementary School has developed a special focus on Social Emotional Learning (SEL). Our SEL Champion, Mrs. Elaine Keller, has developed an outlined of SEL program that includes a focus on each of the Five Core SEL Competencies:
- Self-Awareness
- Self-Management
- Social Awareness
- Relationship Skills
- Responsible Decision-Making
Students use Social Emotional Journals to reflect on their thoughts and feelings weekly.

North Elementary School qualified for a PBIS Model School Award for Resilience. Our renewed focus on PBIS includes a heightened focus on Student of the Week selection process; monitoring the school-wide behavior data and support students via interventions and initiatives (fun PBIS days) rather than consequences, focus on academic positives on a regular basis (Accelerated Reader Shout Outs on a weekly basis).

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

All adults on campus have a role in promoting a positive and inviting school culture and climate. We are striving at our teachers and staff members to be seen around the school, during student transitions, as well as at the community events. Students are recognized for good work through grade level initiatives, as well as highlights during academic awards in grades 3-5.
The school leadership team has pledged to be "All In"; to be dedicated to their jobs, students, and instructional improvement in general.
Campus and classroom beautification is important to us. A clean, uncluttered, and safe learning environment is a necessary component in students; overall success at school (enhanced APTT).
We strive at rewarding students for positive behaviors as well as for their high academic achievements.
Community partners and support is sought to support student recognitions so that a positive culture and climate would always be on the forefront of what we do.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Student Achievement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Student Achievement	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Student Achievement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00