Escambia County School District

Navy Point Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Navy Point Elementary School

1321 PATTON DR, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Monica Ford Harris C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (33%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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 is pending approval by the Escambia 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

Navy Point Elementary School

1321 PATTON DR, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 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	73%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Navy Point Elementary's mission is to cultivate a school community where all members of the community will work together to motivate students to develop into successful learners, good citizens, and future leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Navy Point Elementary's vision is to create a school where all stakeholders work as a united front for the academic success of all students. Navy Point will be the school where excellence for all students take flight.

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
Ford-Harris, Monica	Principal	As principal, its my responsibility to ensure all team members have the resources and supports needed to complete their daily tasks. I am responsible for reviewing data and guiding all stakeholders in the disaggregation of the data for improving student achievement. I am responsible for meeting and planning with math teachers. I am also responsible for providing regular constructive feedback for professional growth through classroom walkthroughs.
Tart, Candace	Assistant Principal	Ms. Tart's responsibility is to support improving student achievement by meeting and planning with science teachers. She will provide the science teachers regularly and timely feedback regarding their data. As a member of the leadership team, she is also responsible for providing constructive feedback for professional growth through weekly classroom walks.
Crisher, Hope	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mrs. Crisher's responsibility is to support improving student achievement by meeting and planning with ELA teachers. She will provide the ELA teachers regularly and timely feedback regarding their data. As a member of the leadership team, she is also responsible for providing constructive feedback for professional growth through weekly classroom walks. She is also leading a book study on disrupting poverty.
Garner, Latris	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Garner's responsibility is to support teachers, students, and families through the RtI/MTSS process. As the RtI Coordinator, she regularly reviews data with teachers and will help them develop academic intervention plans as needed. As part of the RtI process, Ms. Garner is responsible for completing student observations.
Rose, Tiffany	Instructional Media	Mrs. Rose's responsibility will be to assist teachers and students with AR needs. She will be responsible for helping to monitor our school's progress towards meeting the monthly and quarterly reading goals. She will help with the monthly student recognition incentives. She will also help to ensure students are selecting books of choice within their appropriate reading level.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Monica Ford Harris C

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.*
2

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

434

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

9

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

6

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	82	69	68	60	63	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	402
Attendance below 90 percent	15	39	32	25	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	2	5	13	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	6	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	8	14	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	8	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/29/2022

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	67	68	48	65	55	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	10	40	19	26	25	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	7	6	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	47	20	21	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	5	5	9	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	4	13	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	67	68	48	65	55	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	10	40	19	26	25	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	7	6	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	47	20	21	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	5	5	9	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	4	13	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	44%	51%	56%				42%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						53%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						53%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	41%	46%	50%				41%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	73%						53%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						56%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	52%	59%				38%	54%	53%

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	46%	56%	-10%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	27%	51%	-24%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	35%	58%	-23%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	26%	55%	-29%	60%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	32%	55%	-23%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

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	48	59		44	85		47				
ELL	35	73		40	73						
BLK	39	56	55	34	69	73	35				
HSP	47	70		44	74		30				
MUL	39			28							
WHT	50	71		50	78		53				
FRL	41	62	65	41	73	65	35				

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	42	10		36	15		33				
ELL	24			35							
BLK	24	10		18	3		20				
HSP	38	27		26	18		27				
MUL	36			21							
WHT	51	38		42	38		65				
FRL	31	22	42	24	10	15	30				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	35	32		33	55	50	46				
ELL	43	50		26	57		18				
BLK	31	49	50	30	40	41	32				
HSP	55	60		43	68		39				
WHT	44	53		51	65		41				
FRL	40	49	54	37	51	50	40				

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	58
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	55
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	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
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	57
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?

Navy Point demonstrated an upward move based on the 2022 FSA ELA data. We were at 35% proficiency in 2021 and up 9 percentage points to 44% proficiency in 2022. Our math proficiency improved by 20 percentage points from 21% in 2021 to 41% proficiency in 2022. Science increased by 5 percentage points from 37% in 2021 to 42% in 2022.

All sub-groups demonstrated a significant improvement from 2021 to 2022. Although our multi-racial sub-group of students showed improvement by increasing their federal index from 29% in 2021 to 34% in 2022, it was still below the 41% needed to met the requirement.

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

As noted above there were significant increases in our proficiency numbers based on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment and FCAT Science as compared to the 2021 assessment data.

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

Based on the 2022 data there were significant improvements and no new actions will be needed. We will continue implementing our plan with fidelity for continuous improvements.

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

Navy Point demonstrated improvement in all subject area achievement cells, as well as reported sub-group cells.

ELA proficiency increased from 35% in 2021 to 44% in 2022
Math proficiency increased from 21% in 2021 to 41% in 2022
Science proficiency increased from 37% to 42% in 2022

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

We held weekly to bi-weekly planning sessions with the teachers. A member of the administrative team held data meetings Immediately following unit assessments to begin planning for remediation needs. Teachers received weekly feedback on their iReady and AR data.

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

Navy Point will be implementing after-school tutoring opportunities for all K-5 students. We will encourage our more vulnerable population of students to attend. Additional support positions were retained to help with intervention and remediation needs. Teachers continue to implement targeted small group instruction, in addition to the ELA intervention block.

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

Teachers will participate in on-going iReady professional development sessions throughout the year. Math teachers will receive support and PD opportunities through our contact with the Southern Regional Education Board. Teachers will also participate in sharing opportunities regarding their data and problem-solve strategies to help one another by sharing effective instructional practices. These sharing opportunities with be done both vertically and within grade level.

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

Navy Point currently has an active contract with the Southern Regional Education Board for math support. We plan to continue funding the additional personnel that prove to be effective in moving the student achievement data.

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 Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Navy Point's math proficiency has demonstrated an increase based on the Florida Standards Assessment. Proficiency was 27% in 2021 and increased to 41% in 2022. The proficiency percentages for the subgroups are as follow: SWD increased from 36% in 2021 to 44% in 2022, African-Americans increased from 18% to 34%, Hispanics increased from 26% to 44%, Whites increased from 42% to 50%, ELL increased from 35% to 40%, and free and reduced lunch students increased from 24% to 41%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Navy Point will increase the math proficiency percentage from 41% in 2022 to 45% or higher as measured by the 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking data.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Navy Point's administrative team will pull weekly i-Ready math reports to review and provide teachers feedback. Teachers will administer quarterly assessments that are developed by the district Math Department for progress monitoring of students on the standards to have been taught during the nine week period. We will also use the topic assessment data to monitor students' need for reteaching of standards not mastered. F.A.S.T will be used as the school's benchmark assessment to measure students' progress throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Navy Point will be using i-Ready daily lessons for regular monitoring of progress. i-Ready reteach lessons will be used to remediate standards not yet mastered. 2. The Savvas series provides a reteach component that will also be used for remediation. 3. Those students who are in need of enrichment activities will use the study buddy component for independent work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria	The i-Ready tools, as well as Savvas are aligned to the current standards that will be assessed on F.A.S.T. They offer research-based resources that are proven effective for remediation and enrichment needs. Teachers are able to adjust the lessons based on the targeted standards for remediation or reteaching as needed.

**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.

1. Navy Point implements the departmentalization model at grades 1-5. This allows for targeted instructional support by content area. The math teachers will meet weekly to bi-weekly with the Principal depending on the need of the team. During this time, teachers will focus on student data and planning for instruction.

Person Responsible	Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfl.us)

2. The administrative team will conduct classroom walks weekly and provide feedback to teachers. The team will identify any areas where coaching may be necessary. There will be specific look fors such as student engagement, tasks alignment to standards, differentiated groups, and exit tickets to gauge students understanding of the standard.

Person Responsible	Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Navy Point's science proficiency has demonstrated an increase based on the Florida Standards Assessment. Proficiency was 37% in 2021 and increased to 42% in 2022. The proficiency percentages for the subgroups are as follow: SWD increased from 33% in 2021 to 47% in 2022, African-Americans increased from 20% to 35%, Hispanics increased from 27% to 30%, Whites decreased from 65% to 53%, and free and reduced lunch students increased from 27% to 35%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Navy Point will increase the science proficiency percentage from 42% in 2022 to 45% or higher as measured by the 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking data (F.A.S.T.).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Teachers will administer quarterly assessments that are developed by the district Science Department for progress monitoring of students on the standards to have been taught during the nine week period. We will also use the topic assessment data to monitor students' need for reteaching of standards not mastered.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Candace Tart (ctart@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. The HMH series provides a reteach component that will also be used for remediation. 2. Teachers will use Study Island lessons for remediation purposes as needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	HMH offers research-based resources that are proven effective for remediation and enrichment needs. Study Island lessons are aligned with the standards and students complete a quick assessment at the end of lesson for progress monitoring towards standard mastery purposes.

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.

1. Navy Point implements the departmentalization model at grades 1-5. This allows for targeted instructional support by content area. The math teachers will meet weekly to bi-weekly with the Assistant Principal depending on the need of the team. During this time, teachers will focus on student data and planning for instruction.

Person Responsible	Candace Tart (ctart@ecsdfl.us)

2. The administrative team will conduct classroom walks weekly and provide feedback to teachers. The team will identify any areas where coaching may be necessary. There will be specific look fors such as student engagement, tasks alignment to standards, differentiated groups, and exit tickets to gauge students understanding of the standard.

Person Responsible	Candace Tart (ctart@ecsdfl.us)

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Kindergarten ELA proficiency rate was 32% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
First grade ELA proficiency rate was 28% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
Second grade ELA proficiency rate was 29% on the Spring 2022 STAR Reading Assessment.

Students who score at the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2021-2022 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Third grade ELA proficiency rate was 32% on the 2022 FSA.
Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 47% on the 2022 FSA.
Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 43% on the 2022 FSA.

Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has (not) reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups:
Multiracial (39%)

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)

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2022 will increase from 32% in K, 28% in 1st grade, and 29% in 2nd grade on STAR AP4 to 50% on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency will increase from 32% in 3rd grade, 47% in 4th grade, and 43 % in 5th grade on the 2022 FSA to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2023 FAST.

The ELA Proficiency for all identified ESSA subgroups will increase to 50% or higher on new 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring assessments by 23-24.

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.

1. To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.
a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the
standards-based grading rubric.
b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and track the percent of students meeting benchmark on
the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom.
c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and track the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per
the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart.
d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.

2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Literacy Practice Profile tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ford-Harris, Monica, mford-harris@ecsdfl.us

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. §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?

Navy Point uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program.

The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how the various components Into Reading meets Florida's definition of evidence-based. The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.

In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.

Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and RtI teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

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?

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

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
Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership -Develop a school-wide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth. -Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. -Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.	Crisher, Hope, hcrisher@ecsdfl.us
Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching -District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate common lesson planning using the district adopted curriculum and pacing guides, including how to effectively deliver instruction of B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, engagement strategies, etc.). -Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.	Crisher, Hope, hcrisher@ecsdfl.us
Action Step 3: Assessment -Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention. -Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.	Crisher, Hope, hcrisher@ecsdfl.us
Action Step 4: Professional Learning We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following: -Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees -Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period. -Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan -The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading	Crisher, Hope, hcrisher@ecsdfl.us

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.

Grade-levels/departments will meet weekly to discuss planning and support needs.

Hospitality team will have activities throughout the year.
ex. Shoutout board where faculty can be recognized for anything. Each month, two names from the board will be drawn to win a prize.

The school will be contracting with Children's Home Society to provide a social worker 5 days a week to Navy Point Elementary School. The purpose of the social worker (which the school will call Navigators) will be to identify and assess family needs; to guide and inform families of available community resources; and to coordinate access to health and human services, educational and other family support systems (i.e. Food Stamps, financial assistance, etc.

Administration will provide consistent feedback and support.

The school will also provide a mental health counselor through their mental health allocation 3 days a week and a guidance counselor 5 days a week. The counselors will be working with students one on one and in small groups to provide counseling and mental health support. They will also be able to facilitate and assist families with parenting skills, family support, understanding child and adolescent development, and setting home conditions that support learning at each age and grade level.

Navy Point Elementary School will run a clothing closet on campus. The purpose of the clothing closet is to provide new and gently worn clean clothes for students. This will include new underwear, socks, shoes and backpacks for students in need, as identified by the Navigator and or school staff.

Navy Point Elementary School will also continue to implement a structured PBIS plan that will be monitored through PBIS Rewards, RtIB, and the FOCUS student information system. Behavior data is monitored by the administration, guidance, and PBIS team.

Navy Point Elementary School will utilize Navigate 360 for character education. Through the use of Navigate 360 teachers and students will work on lessons that help set goals for behavior and teach students strategies to work through conflict resolution.

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

Administration - consistent discipline, model behaviors we want to see, build positive relationships with students, faculty, and families.

PBIS team - encourage and promote positive behavior

Counselors (guidance and mental health) - working with the social and emotional growth of our students.

Teachers - classroom management, student engagement, family involvement.

Office staff - welcoming, helpful, and clear communication with visitors, families, and other faculty.