Nocatee Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Nocatee Elementary School

4846 SW SHORES AVE, Nocatee, FL 34268

http://nes.desotoschools.com/

Demographics

Principal: Brandy Tackett

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2021

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Desoto 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

Nocatee Elementary School

4846 SW SHORES AVE, Nocatee, FL 34268

http://nes.desotoschools.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	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Desoto 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.

The mission of NES is to prepare all students to be successful citizens and productive workers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of NES is that all students will be confident learners and respected leaders.

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
Cover, Daniel	Principal	
Cookerly, David	Assistant Principal	
Moreno, Babette	Other	
Moxley, Susan	Other	
DeGlopper, Melinda	Math Coach	
Solinger, Christina	Reading Coach	
Hooper, Cari	School Counselor	
Mays, Kaycee	Behavior Specialist	
Marshall, Christine	Attendance/Social Work	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/27/2021, Brandy Tackett

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
32

Total number of students enrolled at the school
469

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	21	9	23	11	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	15	12	13	14	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	6	7	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/6/2021

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	52	64	75	75	116	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	31	27	44	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	6	3	3	6	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	

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	3	15	45	52	88	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	0	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	1	4	9	48	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	52	64	75	75	116	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	31	27	44	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	6	3	3	6	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	

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	3	15	45	52	88	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	0	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	1	4	9	48	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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				29%	38%	57%	25%	34%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	52%	58%	42%	48%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	51%	53%	42%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				38%	45%	63%	35%	41%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	57%	62%	46%	49%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	55%	51%	45%	45%	47%
Science Achievement				34%	37%	53%	29%	33%	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	24%	34%	-10%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	24%	37%	-13%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	41%	-5%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	34%	40%	-6%	62%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	64%	-30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	43%	0%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	36%	-4%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was accessed using the Performance Matters Application. STAR "PR" scores were analyzed from the September (Fall), December (Winter), and Spring (May) District Progress Monitoring Assessments. Proficiency was considered a PR 50% or higher in each grade-level assessment. The Performance Matters program is able to identify students who are Economically Disadvantaged, an English Language Learner, or having a Disability, as defined in the District's Student Data Application (Skyward).

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	58%	69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	58%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	57%	67%
	English Language Learners	33%	50%	50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	31%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	31%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	17%	17%
	English Language Learners	33%	33%	11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	30%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	54%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	50%	0%
	English Language Learners	14%	22%	33%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	28%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	30%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	11%	14%	28%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	36%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	50%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	13%	0%
	English Language Learners	22%	41%	42%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	20%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	16%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	17%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	43%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	43%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	13%	0%
	English Language Learners	30%	36%	50%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	29%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	30%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	31%	20%
	English Language Learners	3%	0%	6%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	47%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	48%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	15%	17%
	English Language Learners	25%	32%	34%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	4%	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	5%	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	9%	13%	N/A
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	N/A

Subgroup Data Review

	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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups											
SWD	9	43		12	50		9				
ELL	16	31		25	34		8				
BLK	26	50		39							
HSP	24	39	42	30	35	50	5				
MUL	15			23							
WHT	27	50		27	46		45				
FRL	22	40	47	31	45	56	21				

	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											
Subgroups											
SWD	25	30	38	23	40						
ELL	18	44	56	39	64	81	11				
BLK	32			40							
HSP	23	44	56	44	65	67	30				
WHT	37	59	63	30	47	58	39				
FRL	29	48	53	41	59	63	30				

	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											
Subgroups											
SWD	5	30	31	11	40	50	9				
ELL	16	37	50	31	44	50					
BLK	23			21	50						
HSP	22	41	48	38	43	53	20				
WHT	28	43	36	33	47	43	39				
FRL	24	42	44	34	45	44	28				

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	26
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	38
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	33
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	19
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
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?

ELA (Reading) proficiency at NES is below district and state expectations. When comparing 2019 district and state results, NES is 8% and 28% below, respectively. ELA (Reading) proficiency at NES was the lowest performing data component during the 2018 assessment year.

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

ELA- Bottom 25% SWD, Black/AA students, Math- Bottom 25%, SWD, Black/AA , Science- Bottom 25%

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 is continuing to implement research-based strategies to assist teachers in planning and delivering targeted instruction, using a "what students should know and be able to do" approach. RBS to implement this year will include Amira for diagnostic and intervention, foundational skills in Phonics , Vocabulary, AR- practice fluency and vocabulary.

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

There were no measurable improvements in any areas.

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

NA

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

Through a monthly review of data including, but not limited to, classroom assessments, benchmark assessment data, teacher collected data, and STAR results, specific areas of need can be identified and teachers can focus on one intervention at a time and implement rigorous instruction to accelerate and scaffold student learning. Identify specific skills in grade levels to accelerate learning.

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.

1 Provide coaching and modeling of grade level instruction that meets the rigor of the standards
2. Develop and maintain system to assess and track student mastery of standards
3 Meet individual student needs by improving the impact of intervention time.
4 Provide teachers with collaboration time to analyze data and use data to plan instruction

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

Continue yearly training, maintain system to assess and track student mastery of standards, continue intervention time, and continue to schedule teachers with collaboration time to analyze data and use data to plan instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through a monthly review of data including, but not limited to, classroom assessments, benchmark assessment data, teacher collected data, and STAR results, specific areas of need can be identified and teachers can focus on one intervention at a time and implement rigorous instruction to accelerate and scaffold student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve ELA proficiency by a minimum of 8% as measured by FSA
Monitoring:	Prioritized Strategies 1. Provide all students grade level instruction in ELA 2. Increase teachers' knowledge of students' specific needs through deep data analysis 3.Leverage weekly collaboration to design instruction based on students' needs 4. Utilize high yield curriculum to ensure students meet the rigor of the standards 5.Students in identified subgroups will obtain a minimum of 41% of Federal Percent of Points Index (SWD, Black/African American, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Solinger (christina.solinger@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide coaching and modeling of grade level instruction that meets the rigor of the standards Develop and maintain system to assess and track student mastery of standards Meet individual student needs by improving the impact of intervention time. Provide teachers with collaboration time to analyze data and use data to plan instruction Leverage curriculum programs to expose students to grade level standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1 Provide coaching and modeling of grade level instruction that meets the rigor of the standards 2. Develop and maintain system to assess and track student mastery of standards 3 Meet individual student needs by improving the impact of intervention time. 4 Provide teachers with collaboration time to analyze data and use data to plan instruction

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through a monthly review of data including, but not limited to, classroom assessments, benchmark assessment data, teacher collected data, and STAR results, specific areas of need can be identified and teachers can focus on one intervention at a time and implement rigorous instruction to accelerate and scaffold student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve Math proficiency by a minimum of 8% as measured by FSA
Monitoring:	1. Adjust math block to utilize instructional time and for intervention, small group 2. Utilize collaboration time to determine learning target, depth and rigor and to identify prerequisite skills 3. Provide instruction that moves from concrete pictorial to abstract 4. Students in identified subgroups will obtain a minimum of 41% of Federal Percent of Points Index (SWD, Black/African American, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Develop master schedule to increase daily math instruction and intervention. 2. Increase teachers' depth of knowledge of math standards and foundational skills 3. Provide coaching and modeling of grade level instruction that meets the rigor of the standards 4. Develop Instructional strategies that use students' Background knowledge to build new learning. 5. Provide foundation skill practice through the use of daily number talks at the launch of each math lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through a monthly review of data including, but not limited to, classroom assessments, benchmark assessment data, teacher collected data, and STAR results, specific areas of need can be identified and teachers can focus on one intervention at a time and implement rigorous instruction to accelerate and scaffold student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through a monthly review of data including, but not limited to, classroom assessments, benchmark assessment data, teacher collected data, and testing results, specific areas of need can be identified and teachers can focus on one intervention at a time and implement rigorous instruction to accelerate and scaffold student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve Science proficiency by a minimum of 8% as measured by FSA
Monitoring:	1. Increase science instructional time to include time for evaluation, investigation, and inquiry integration through the addition of the STEM enrichment class K-5 2. Utilize collaboration time to unpack the standards and identify content limits and integration across content K-5. 3. Provide instruction that advances students' conceptual understanding in science 4. Students in identified subgroups will obtain a minimum of 41% of Federal Percent of Points Index (SWD, Black/African American, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Cookerly (david.cookerly@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Increase students' science engagement and proficiency
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1 Provide coaching and modeling of grade level instruction that meets the rigor of the standards 2. Develop and maintain system to assess and track student mastery of standards 3 Meet individual student needs by improving the impact of intervention time. 4 Provide teachers with collaboration time to analyze data and use data to plan instruction

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.

Progress towards the priorities within the Schoolwide Improvement Plan will be shared regularly with our faculty. Staff, parents/families, and School Advisory Council(SAC).

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.

Research indicates parent and community involvement has a positive effect on student achievement. The continued success of our students is built upon the establishment of trusting relationships between parents/families and other community stakeholders. As part of our commitment to supporting the needs of students, Nocatee Elementary (NES) will host parent involvement events (virtual options will be made available) designed to inform and engage parents/families in the learning process. These events will include: literacy, math, and science nights with parent friendly activities that can be used at home to practice learned skills. A curriculum night will also be held to orient parents to the following: grade level curriculum; teacher expectations, routines, and procedures; school rules and policies, etc. Training is also available to parents on the use of Skyward to monitor their student's progress, attendance, and discipline. In addition, NES is fully implementing PBIS for the 21-22 SY and how best to implement. The NES website, Facebook page, and school App all serve as methods to increase family engagement.

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

SAC Committee - Support classroom teacher learning for all students. Science supplies and student celebrations. Consisting of Parents, Students, Community members, teachers, support staff, and principal.
Booster Club- Will be an important part of community involvement events, Family engagement: Fall festival, family dances, Science Night, Math Night, and Dr. Seuss Night.
PBIS Committee will continue implementation to all classes.
Title I- We will invite the parents in to multiple training and family events this year
Sunshine Committee- This group will boost teacher morale and also help support teachers/staff in need.

Part V: Budget

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

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