

St. Lucie Public Schools

Northport K 8 School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Northport K 8 School

250 NW FLORESTA DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/npk/>

Demographics

Principal: Glenn Rustay

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2021-22 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* Asian Students* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Northport K 8 School

250 NW FLORESTA DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/npk/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>78%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>77%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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 is to ensure all students graduate from a safe and caring school, equipped with knowledge, skills, and the desire to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Northport K-8 in partnership with parents and community will become a premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. Northport K-8's name will be synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our school's promise is to move from good to great focusing on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for every student, every day. Together... we ARE Northport!

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rustay, Glenn	Principal	
Cash, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Drost, Mehgan	Assistant Principal	
Hussein, Ahmed	Math Coach	
Lankow, Diana	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/18/2022, Glenn Rustay

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

42

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,260

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	88	93	110	121	186	180	209	0	0	0	0	1162
Attendance below 90 percent	30	28	30	30	31	34	66	72	88	0	0	0	0	409
One or more suspensions	4	5	7	5	6	19	60	39	63	0	0	0	0	208
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	15	1	27	15	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	18	4	29	16	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	38	39	65	61	73	0	0	0	0	276
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	44	55	56	58	91	0	0	0	0	332
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	2	2	102	88	109	0	0	0	0	306

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	1	14	46	50	106	97	117	0	0	0	0	434

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/18/2022

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	77	73	78	95	113	99	186	183	190	0	0	0	0	1094
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	15	21	31	18	34	39	42	0	0	0	0	230
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	3	9	36	32	23	0	0	0	0	109
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	14	4	35	37	32	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	21	8	46	54	28	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	20	51	40	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	40	49	39	0	0	0	0	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	4	2	2	0	117	113	105	0	0	0	0	344
	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	1	1	38	47	34	101	101	105	0	0	0	0	428

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	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	9

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	77	73	78	95	113	99	186	183	190	0	0	0	0	1094
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	15	21	31	18	34	39	42	0	0	0	0	230
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	3	9	36	32	23	0	0	0	0	109
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	14	4	35	37	32	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	21	8	46	54	28	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	20	51	40	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	40	49	39	0	0	0	0	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	4	2	2	0	117	113	105	0	0	0	0	344
	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	1	1	38	47	34	101	101	105	0	0	0	0	428

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	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	9

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	53%	55%				51%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						54%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						39%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	42%	41%	42%				58%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	48%						62%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						44%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	39%	50%	54%				52%	58%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	55%	59%				71%	74%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	47%	50%	-3%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2022					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
07	2022					
	2019	48%	49%	-1%	52%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2022					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	47%	3%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2022					
	2019	51%	47%	4%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
07	2022					
	2019	52%	50%	2%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	34%	15%	46%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	46%	3%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	48%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	67%	67%	0%	71%	-4%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	51%	42%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	33	34	19	37	39	17	47			
ELL	28	46	35	35	42	29	27	70			
ASN	43	50		43	50						
BLK	37	44	27	37	46	44	31	74	82		
HSP	41	48	32	42	48	41	33	75	70		
MUL	48	47		55	59		69	60			
WHT	48	52	47	47	49	68	49	83	62		
FRL	38	45	32	38	47	49	34	73	69		
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	19	38	28	17	31	26	18	50			
ELL	31	46	40	32	47	38	26	83			
ASN	58			67							
BLK	33	35	32	30	35	37	23	54	33		
HSP	43	47	36	39	37	29	43	76	57		
MUL	38	33		46	38		33				
WHT	53	53	25	50	47	41	58	74	63		
FRL	39	41	27	38	38	32	37	67	46		
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	19	28	22	24	43	40	23	38			
ELL	30	41	43	47	59	56	35				
ASN	71	69		76	47						

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
BLK	40	51	34	47	57	37	34	74	100		
HSP	54	53	40	63	66	59	58	61	91		
MUL	56	49		69	67		67	60			
WHT	57	56	44	61	64	40	58	78	82		
FRL	45	51	37	52	61	43	49	60	90		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	47
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 proficiency is trending negatively, from 51% in 2019, 43% in 2021, and 42% in 2022. Similar trends exist for ELA Learning Gains and ELA BQ. Civics scores rebounded from a low of 69% in 2021 to surpass the 2019 score of 71% with 76% in 2022. Math proficiency has not regained the 2019 58%, reaching only 42% in 2022. While Learning Gains reflect a similar trend, Math BQ posted a jump of 47% from the 2021 average of 35%. Science scores dropped from 41% in 2021 to 39% in 2022.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement exists in ELA, with none of the three metrics regaining percentages lost from 2019. Secondary to that is the need for improvement in Science for both fifth and eighth grades.

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

ELA teachers experienced a transition from LAFS to BEST standards, along with new textbooks in all grades. Overall, COVID-19 caused a large increase in quarantines for both students and teachers.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The component demonstrating the most improvement was Math BQ, increasing from 35% in 2021 to 47% in 2022.

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

Contributing factors included a new focus by the Math Coach addressing CLPs and targeted instruction.

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

Laser focus on Standards-based instruction
Increased Collaborative learning and Planning time across all grades, 5x weekly in K-5
Analysis of data from Unit Assessments and Progress Monitoring

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.

Continuing District support with the CLP process
Data analysis after implementation of PM1 and PM2
BEST standards: continuing use in ELA, initial use in K-5
Professional development regarding resources related to newly adopted Math textbook in K-5 (Savvas)
Leveled Literacy Intervention in K-5

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

Implementation of LLI for Tier 2 in K-5

Implementation of The Writing Revolution in Intensive Reading/Tier 3 classes in 6-8

Implementation of Benchmark Advanced in K-5

Implementation of Savvas Envision Math in K-5

Continued services of Literacy Coaches (3), Math Coaches (2), and Reading Interventionists (3).

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: The rationale for this focus is a decrease in proficiency from 43% in 2021 to 42% in 2022. This is a significant decrease from 51% in 2019. Learning Gains showed a slight increase (45% to 48%), as did BQ Learning Gains (32% to 34%). ELA performance is experiencing a sluggish rebound to pre-Covid levels.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2022-23 school year, general education teachers, as well as teachers of students with disabilities, will participate in focused Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) meetings with their respective teams/grade levels. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons utilizing best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will result in a 13-point increase in ELA for the lowest 25%ile (including SWD).
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: Assigned administrators participate in CLPs on a weekly visit. Lesson plans will be monitored for pacing. The CLP protocol includes a process for analyzing data from Unit Assessments and iReady.
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Benchmark Advance K-5
 Leveled Literacy Intervention Tier 2 and Tier 3, K-5
 Savvas My Perspective grades 6-8
 Intensive Reading courses taught by Reading interventionists in grades 6-8
 The Writing Revolution grades 6-8
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research has indicated that explicit instruction in text-based writing and reading comprehension will increase proficiency, which in turn leads to learning gains.
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide professional development in standards-based instruction, data-driven lesson design, and differentiation.

Person Responsible Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Utilize District Supports available through Teaching, Learning, and Leading.

Person Responsible Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Facilitate Collaborative Learning and Planning 5x weekly in K-5, addressing the gradual release model. Sessions to include teachers of Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible Diana Lankow (diana.lankow@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The rationale for this focus is while we increased in Math proficiency by 2 points to 42%, we continue to lag behind our 2019 score of 58%. The bottom 25%ile increased 12 points from 35% in 2021 to 47%, however, the smaller increase in proficiency indicates a greater need for emphasis.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

During the 2022-2023 school year, general education and teachers of students with disabilities will participate in Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) meetings with their respective teams/grades, focusing on quality student work. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons utilizing best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will results in an 8-point increase in Math Proficiency (including SWD), as measured by FAST testing.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

CLP implementation will be monitored for fidelity across all levels. The CLP Cycle includes a data protocol for monitoring District Tests, iReady, and PM 1 and PM2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mehgan Drost (mehgan.drost@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Quality instruction has the largest positive impact on student achievement. Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction, in small groups, to increase achievement in Math.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Differentiated instruction is a high-effect size strategy that allows teachers to work with small groups of students to instruct them at their level of learning and specific Skill(s).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will analyze student data to identify their lowest 25%ile, near proficiency, and fragile students.

Person Responsible Mehgan Drost (mehgan.drost@stlucieschools.org)

Math Coach will instruct and model for teachers the gradual release model with fidelity, including how to implement differentiated instruction within the math routine.

Person Responsible Ahmed Hussein (ahmed.hussein@stlucieschools.org)

Teachers will utilize new math textbooks for whole group instruction, all grade levels published by Savvas. Khan Academy will be used for centers and reinforcement of skills in 6-8.

Person Responsible Ahmed Hussein (ahmed.hussein@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We will focus on the transition from Florida Standards in math to the BEST standards. The rationale is to ensure quality instruction in grades K-8 embraces the new standards.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, teachers in grades K-8, including teachers of students with disabilities, will instruct Math using the BEST standards, as measured by frequent Instructional walkthroughs and observations.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The administration will conduct informal walkthroughs each week, and instructional coaches will conduct walkthroughs as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mehgan Drost (mehgan.drost@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Savvas Envision Mathematics grade K-8, newly adopted math Series Savvas Realize Additional Coach to provide support in K-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research has indicated that explicit instruction in mathematics, along with the use of manipulatives and differentiated groups, will increase proficiency, which in turn leads to learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide access to Professional Development on BEST standards in Mathematics and ELA, data-driven instruction, and standards-based Instruction.

Person Responsible

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Provide access to Professional Development regarding new textbook adoption and supplemental resources.

Person Responsible

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Utilize support from District personnel available from Teaching, Learning, and Leading.

Person Responsible

Glenn Rustay (glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored below 50% in proficiency in ELA. Identified grades are as follows:
 Grade 3.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2022-23 school year, at least 51% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA as measured by FAST scores.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored using iReady diagnostic, Unit Assessments, and Growth Monitoring of tiered intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Tiered intervention in all grades with special attention to K - 2. Use of Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction, and tiered intervention using LLI. School-based coaching support in collaborative learning and planning, as well as a focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Benchmark Advance is the adopted text for ELA instruction in grades K-5. LLI is a research-based intervention designed to provide instruction, used in our Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction. Certified, reading-endorsed Coaches provide coaching support. The K-5 Reading Interventionist is also certified and Reading Endorsed.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group and small group using tools such as Unit Assessments and SLPS K-2 Assessments.

Person Responsible

Glenn Rustay (glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback.

Person Responsible

Diana Lankow (diana.lankow@stlucieschools.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students at all grade levels identified as part of the subgroup Students with Disabilities continue to score well below their peers, scoring 31% on the Federal Index in 2021-2022.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2022-23 school year, the Federal Index for Students With Disabilities will meet the threshold of 41% as measured by FAST Assessments.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored using iReady diagnostic, Unit Assessments, District Assessments, and PM Assessments for BEST standards. AGPRs may also be used to measure progress toward IEP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Glenn Rustay (glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Students with Disabilities will be instructed by certified teachers with training on strategies such as small-group instruction and project-based learning. Students may be served in self-contained classrooms, resource class settings, and/or the Support/Facilitation model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This strategy meets the needs of students with Education Plans and Individual Education Plans.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Master Schedule will reflect the availability of classes according to the needs of students.

Person Responsible

Mehgan Drost (mehgan.drost@stlucieschools.org)

School-based ESE Specialists will monitor instruction and ensure compliance with procedural safeguards.

Person Responsible

Mehgan Drost (mehgan.drost@stlucieschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

An area of focus is standards-based instruction. The transition from LAFs to BEST standards is ongoing. As measured by iReady Spring Diagnostic, 27% of kindergartners, 47% of first graders, and 53% of second graders are not on track for proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

During the 2022-2023 school year, 37% of third graders, 43% of fourth graders, and 48% of fifth graders were proficient as measured by FSA. An area of focus is standards-based instruction. The transition from LAFs to BEST standards is ongoing. A review of the data indicates the need for a laser focus on identifying critical elements of the standards and increased use of the gradual release model.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 51% of students in grades K-2 will show proficiency in ELA as measured by FAST Early Literacy and Reading.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

During the 2022-2023 school year, 37% of third graders, 43% of fourth graders, and 48% of fifth graders were proficient as measured by FSA. By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 51% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will show proficiency in ELA as measured by FAST Progress Monitoring.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitoring of focus areas will occur through reading rounds conducted by the administration and literacy coaches, an increase of CLPs to 5x weekly, with two days dedicated to ELA, and fidelity checks for core curriculum and tiered interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cash, Lisa, lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Tier 1 instruction is provided through the use of Benchmark Advance, which is on the state adoption list. Heggerty will be used in K-1 classrooms for phonemic awareness; Heggerty does not meet strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence; however, the following IES Practice Guide Recommendation(s) support the program: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through Grade 3, Recommendation(s) #2, Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters, strong evidence. These recommendation(s) were built into the program by explicit teaching of phonemes and their connections to letters and sounds. Tiered intervention is provided using Leveled Literacy Intervention (Strong), Imagine (Promising) is used with ELL students, and iReady (Promising).

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Research regarding LLI indicates significant differences on Non-Word Fluency and Oral Reading Fluency. Data gathered during the 2021-22 school year initial implementation indicates strong performance in all areas, with student growth higher than in prior years.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

Progress monitoring of literacy instruction will be ongoing. The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly and consists of administration and members from each grade level. The Team is tasked with reporting the strengths/weaknesses of strategies shared. Topics include progress on the pacing of the tier 1 curriculum and progress of tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Literacy coaches and admin will conduct regular walkthroughs to conduct literacy checks.

Cash, Lisa,
lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org

Professional Development will be made available to all instructional staff to address learning needs in standards-based instruction, Benchmark Advance resources and materials, and progress monitoring processes. This includes further professional development on the CLP process, which will increase the effectiveness of planning for instruction.

Cash, Lisa,
lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Northport K-8 will implement a Culture and Learning Environment focus in all classrooms using Sanford-Harmony in K-5 classrooms and Lion's Quest in 6-8 classrooms. All students on campus will participate in daily circles, check-ins, and other activities geared toward developing the competencies of a Positive Culture and Learning Environment. With time embedded in daily schedules, students and staff are immersed in activities that foster self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, decision-making, responsibility, and building healthy relationships. There is an established site-based CLE Team that meets monthly to reflect on our school culture and environment, review all available panorama data, and focus on our strengths and areas in need of growth.

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

Glenn Rustay, Principal

Lisa Cash, Assistant Principal

Mehgan Drost, Assistant Principal

Melody Nieves, Instructional Coach, CLE Cohort and Liaison

Arismarie Rosa, School-wide Behavior Tech, monitoring students with daily check-ins/check-outs

Lorena Wilson, Instructional Coach, CLE Fidelity Checks

Elizabeth Butterworth, Graduation Coach

Elisabet Flores, Middle School Teacher, implements Lion's Quest curriculum

Beth Dickinson, Middle School Counselor

Diane Crumpton, Elementary School Counselor

Herenta Evbuomwan, School-based ESE Specialist

Alexis Pryde, 2nd Grade Teacher

Rosa Apostolico, Third Grade Teacher