

The School District of Desoto

Nocatee Elementary 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Nocatee Elementary School

4846 SW SHORES AVE, Nocatee, FL 34268

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

Demographics

Principal: Brandy Tackett

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2021

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
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (36%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%)
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	CSI

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Nocatee Elementary School

4846 SW SHORES AVE, Nocatee, FL 34268

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

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	71%

School Grades History

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

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

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/7/2021, Brandy Tackett

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.*

1

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

423

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

8

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

2

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	57	74	70	95	63	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420
Attendance below 90 percent	7	12	13	16	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	17	7	14	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	9	5	11	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	9	28	39	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	4	11	14	23	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	3	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	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	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

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	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	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	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	1	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	6	7	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	31%	34%	56%				29%	38%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						49%	52%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						56%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	43%	50%				38%	45%	63%
Math Learning Gains	44%						56%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						63%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	10%	39%	59%				34%	37%	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	24%	34%	-10%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	24%	37%	-13%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	36%	41%	-5%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

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	34%	40%	-6%	62%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	64%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	43%	0%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	32%	36%	-4%	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	16	35	33	28	48	50	13				
ELL	21	33	28	21	40	41	3				
BLK	23			29							
HSP	32	44	35	36	41	38	11				
WHT	32	36		40	51		8				
FRL	29	42	41	35	44	44	11				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	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				
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	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				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	33
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	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?

There was little growth across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas this year. As a trend, there was a drop in the percentage of bottom quartile scores in both reading and math.

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

There was little improvement in "gain" scores in reading and math as well. The highest growth areas were in proficiency in reading and math. Science was our lowest performing cell showing a drop of 10 points from the previous year. This indicates the areas in greatest need of improvement are growth in reading and math and overall science scores.

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

A contributing factor to this need for improvement was the cohort of students in fifth grade who were most affected by school closures during Covid as there were no retentions that year. Additionally, Nocatee has a large number of novice teachers who need additional strategies and tools to provide on-level instruction.

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

The area of greatest improvement was overall proficiency in reading and math, particularly in the third grade, although the school realizes there is continued need to improve this. Third grade also showed the highest gains in growth in both reading and math.

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

The third grade team was very data driven and had a high understanding of standards and expected level of performance. The consistency of standards based instruction was also a contributing factor.

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

In order to accelerate learning there is a need to focus not only on the underperforming students but also on those student who need additional enrichment. There continues to be a need to support teachers in understanding and delivering rigorous and on-grade level instruction.

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

Professional development for teachers will include sessions on providing standards-based explicit instruction, planning for tiered instruction, small group instructional strategies and using data to drive instruction. Additionally the school will focus on utilizing research-proven instructional strategies to deliver instruction.

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

Teachers will be supported by school based and district coaches in order to develop their own professional tool kits. Additionally the school will utilize both content coaches and lead teachers to support the professional development of teachers which will in turn sustain improvement efforts in the coming years.

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

After a review of the FSA data, teacher evaluation data and the monthly STAR results, it is evident there is a need to improve instructional practice in the area of ELA. Based on the data there is a discrepancy in the delivery level of instruction and the expected level of performance of the standards.

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

Improve ELA proficiency by a minimum of 10% as measured by Fast State Assessment.

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

This area of focus will be implemented and monitored through the following prioritized strategies and monitoring plan:
 1. Provide all students with explicit standards based 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 individual students' needs
 4. Focus planning time on explicit small group instruction and planning for independent time during teacher collaboration.
 Monitoring of these outcomes and subsequent ELA proficiency will be done through analysis of student data, observations during instruction and participation in collaborative sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Solinger (christina.solinger@desotoschools.com)

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

The evidence-based strategy we will focus on to reach our goals is Explicit Instruction. This will be accomplished through:
 Providing coaching and modeling of grade level instruction that meets the rigor of the standards.
 Developing and maintaining system to assess and track student mastery of standards.
 Meeting individual student needs by improving the impact of intervention time.
 Providing teachers with collaboration time to analyze data and use data to plan instruction.
 Build teacher understanding of backward design methods using standard aligned assessments to plan high yield instructional practices, so all students are exposed to grade level content and rigor.

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

We believe teachers will be able to make the content comprehensible and determine specific student performance levels when they are able to plan explicit instruction that meets the level of the standard.

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 coaching and modeling of grade level instruction that meets the rigor of the standards.

Person Responsible Christina Solinger (christina.solinger@desotoschools.com)

Develop and maintain system to assess and track student mastery of standards

Person Responsible Christina Solinger (christina.solinger@desotoschools.com)

Meet individual student needs by improving the impact of intervention time.

Person Responsible Christina Solinger (christina.solinger@desotoschools.com)

Utilize teacher collaboration time to analyze data and use this data to plan instruction

Person Responsible David Cookerly (david.cookerly@desotoschools.com)

Provide substitutes once a quarter to each grade level to release teachers for grade level professional development.

Person Responsible Daniel Cover (daniel.cover@desotoschools.com)

Develop grade level collaborative planning teams/Taskforces to align instruction to assessments, standards, and best practices.

Person Responsible Christina Solinger (christina.solinger@desotoschools.com)

Identify and train grade level content experts in ELA. Teachers from the school will participate in a district level cooperative planning Task Force to increase their understanding of curriculum design, instructional planning, alignment to standards, and assessment development and implementation.

Person Responsible Christina Solinger (christina.solinger@desotoschools.com)

#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.

Science was determined to be a critical need due to the low scores on the last State Assessment (Spring 2022) and the downward proficiency trend over the past three years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improve Science proficiency by a minimum of 18% as measured by state assessment

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by utilizing data from ongoing quarterly and classroom assessments results in Performance Matters. At these monitoring meetings the team will modify the plan based on assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Increase students' science engagement through the use of physical activities and organizational strategies such as note taking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

At Nocatee we recognize the need for students to have active learning experiences to understand abstract content and to be exposed to new learning in a variety of ways. In addition to planning lesson that actively engage students, additional support through Penda Science will provide opportunities for students to experience concepts of science with a focus on standards-based learning,

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.

Utilize teacher collaboration at least monthly to plan targeted, high student engagement science lesson based on standards.

Person Responsible

David Cookerly (david.cookerly@desotoschools.com)

Monitor the planning and delivery of highly engaging science lessons and provide timely feedback and support to teachers base don student performance and analysis of assessments.

Person Responsible

Daniel Cover (daniel.cover@desotoschools.com)

Assess the feasibility of additional science curriculum and labs for intervention and enrichment.

Person Responsible Daniel Cover (daniel.cover@desotoschools.com)

Map and plan science instruction strategically so both classroom teacher and the STEM specialist are addressing key standards with strategies that complement each other. Identify high yield standards that should be addressed in multiple grade levels.

Person Responsible Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

Identify and train grade level content experts in Science. Teachers from the school will participate in a district level cooperative planning Task Force to increase their understanding of curriculum design, instructional planning, alignment to standards, and assessment development and implementation.

Person Responsible Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

#3. 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.

Instructional practice related to math was identified as the area of focus due to the limited growth observed in math and the inconsistency in student achievement across grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improve math proficiency by a minimum of 18% as measured by FAST

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through observation of application of strategies at teacher collaboration and professional development sessions and through ongoing analysis of data. The school plans to monitor data from benchmark and progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence-based strategy that will be employed this year in math is Explicit, standards-based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The rationale for selecting this strategy stemmed from the analysis of math data by grade, teacher and subgroup. It was determined through analysis that the inconsistencies in achievement among math classes could be improved through explicit, standards-based training for all teachers.

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 coaching and modeling of grade level instruction that meets the rigor of the standards

Person Responsible

Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

During collaboration time unpack the standards, identify content limits and determine student performance expectations and plan instruction to meet these expectations.

Person Responsible

Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

Provide explicit intervention and small group instruction based on student need as identified through analysis of student work and both formative and summative assessment data.

Person Responsible

Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

Identify teachers in need of additional and/or one on one coaching based on classroom observations and review of student performance.

Person Responsible

Daniel Cover (daniel.cover@desotoschools.com)

Provide substitutes once a quarter to each grade level to release teachers for grade level professional development.

Person Responsible Daniel Cover (daniel.cover@desotoschools.com)

Provide PD on putting Math practices into action and also questioning techniques.

Person Responsible Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

Identify and train grade level content experts in Math. Teachers from the school will participate in a district level cooperative planning Task Force to increase their understanding of curriculum design, instructional planning, alignment to standards, and assessment development and implementation.

Person Responsible Melinda DeGlopper (melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com)

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

Explicit Instruction in foundational skills during interventions and tier 1 instruction.

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

The instruction practice we will utilize in Grades 3-5 is 'Planning and Implementing Differentiated Instruction' based on individual student needs during interventions and tier 1 instruction.

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)

In K-1, the FAST assessment will be used to measure student performance from beginning to end of year. The goal for 2023 is to increase overall proficiency to 70% and increase level 4 and 5 to 50% of students.

By the MOY assessment there will be a minimum of 45% of students scoring in the proficiency range.

In second grade a minimum of 70% of students will be identified as "on track" by the end of the year. At the end of first grade (2021-22), 55% of these students were identified as proficient in first grade standards. By MOY there will be a minimum of 60% of second graders identified as "on track".

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

More than 55% of students in grade 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. At the end of the 2021-22 school year, 30% percent of students in grades 3-5 scored as proficient or above which indicates an expected increase in proficiency of 25 percentage points.

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.

Each grade K-3 student's progress will be monitored using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system with the baseline set at beginning of Year (BOY), and monitoring assessments at mid and end of year (MOY and EOY) to ensure growth is being monitored and actions are taken to address areas of need. The end of year data will be used to evaluate impact of instructional practices and utilization of professional development strategies. We will also utilize attendance records in small group and pull out sessions to determine the effectiveness of the specific strategies implemented. Classroom visits and use of professional development and collaboration time will be monitored using walkthroughs, notes from meetings, and PD surveys to determine areas of additional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Solinger, Christina, christina.solinger@desotoschools.com

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?

The evidence-based practices that will be used this year are the four areas of foundational reading skills from The Institute of Educational Sciences What Works Clearing House: 1. Academic language skills, 2. Phonemic Awareness Skills, 3. Phonological Awareness Skills, and 4. Daily reading practice using connected text. These skills align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and across the grade levels identified. These practices also align with the B.E.S.T. ELA standards and are supported with the HMH curriculum.

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 four key practices chosen are based on the Science of Reading research and have a proven record of effectiveness. We feel these key practices address the needs of our students by building a strong literacy foundation which is fundamental to literacy development.

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****Area of Focus 1:**

Literacy Leadership: School administration assigned to literacy and the reading coach facilitates use of resources and training content that is set up by district at the school level. Includes setting schoolwide expectations and a vision of success in literacy through the implementation of the Science of Reading, Explicit Instruction, and MTSS. Administrator will monitor implementation of training outcomes and work with the literacy coach identifies areas of success and concern. Grade level chairs will ensure time is provided during collaboration to address expectations and needs of teachers. This will include co-teaching and planning, model lessons and facilitating peer observations. During weekly cooperative planning meetings, data analysis sessions, and regularly scheduled peer observations and established coaching cycles based on teacher and student needs. The coach will provide one on one coaching and personal support based on walkthroughs, data analysis and teacher needs.

Solinger, Christina,
christina.solinger@desotoschools.com

Area of Focus 2: Planning and Implementing Differentiated Instruction based on individual student needs during interventions and tier 1 instruction.
Literacy Leadership: Provide resources and training that focus on the planning and implementation of differentiated instruction. Participate in the monitoring of action steps. Support coaches and teachers in the application of newly acquired skills and knowledge.
Literacy Coaching: Work with teachers to monitor, analyze, and adjust instruction to better meet the needs of students during Tier 1 instruction and intervention. This will be done during weekly cooperative planning meetings, monthly data analysis sessions, and regularly scheduled peer observations and established coaching cycles based on teacher and student needs.

Solinger, Christina,
christina.solinger@desotoschools.com

Assessment of Focus 1: Teachers will administer progress-monitoring assessments in foundational skills and track performance every 4 weeks as determined by need. They will use data to adjust instruction and deliver intervention lessons based on needs. The effectiveness of these strategies will be reviewed during monthly data meetings.

Professional Learning: Teachers will participate in UFLI Science of Reading professional development program to learn and practice the Science of Reading and Explicit Instruction. They will work as PLC's in grade level teams across the district to determine effectiveness of instruction, reflect, and plan adjustments to meet the needs of students. The school will have monthly professional development by grade level to enhance their understanding and application of Science of Reading and Explicit Instruction. Teachers will participate in a district level cooperative planning Task Force to increase their understanding of curriculum design, instructional planning, alignment standards, and assessment development and implementation.

Solinger, Christina,
christina.solinger@desotoschools.com

Assessment of Focus 2: Teachers will administer regular formative and summative assessments in standards based skills and strategies. They will track student performance and use that data to adjust instruction and deliver specific scaffolds to support student understanding and application each quarter.

Professional Learning: Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses on differentiating instruction during the ELA block. They will increase their knowledge in how to use data to group students, appropriate

Solinger, Christina,
christina.solinger@desotoschools.com

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

scaffolds to increase understanding, and building student capacity and independence in applying newly taught skills.

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.

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 22-23 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 school culture and environment.

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.