

Alachua County Public Schools

C. W. Norton Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

C. W. Norton Elementary School

2200 NW 45TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/norton>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Norton Elementary School, we are fostering a community of leaders. Our goal is to create a safe and positive school environment that enhances student learning through teaching and recognizing our four expectations:

Be Respectful
Be Safe
Be Responsible
Be Cooperative

We celebrate the leader within us all!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learning is the key at Norton Elementary. We strive for excellence by actively engaging all students, parents, staff members and the community in a safe, nurturing, and positive learning environment.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mayo, Elena	Principal	The school principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; sets school-wide goals; ensures the school based team is implementing MTSS/Rtl, conducts assessment of MTSS/Rtl skills with the school staff, ensures implementation of interventions, reviews documentation; ensures training is conducted annually and as needed for individual teachers; participates in Educational Planning Team meetings; participates in grade level data chats and other grade level meetings; facilitates leadership team.
Harris, Annie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for assisting in behavior support and training for teachers. She helps develop and implement behavioral interventions in conjunction with the BRT. She completes classroom walk-throughs and observations. The Assistant Principal provides curriculum support and training for teachers. She participates Educational Planning Team Meetings and Leadership Meetings. She assists with formation of common grade level assessments and provides support for data collection of assessment scores.
Ballentine, Tristin	Instructional Coach	The Title 1 Instructional Coach oversees the MTSS/RTI process by providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making ensuring MTSS is implemented according to district guidelines. She oversees the implementation and documentation of interventions. She also oversees grade-level data chats. The Instructional Coach supports classroom teachers in implementing tier 1 instruction including planning and coaching. She meets weekly with the leadership team on matters of concern/decision making.
James, Bevon	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT): Oversees school-wide behavior plan; Positive Behavior Support Chair; implements individual behavior plans; monitors/inputs behavior data (district data base); assists teachers with implementation of classroom behavior plans; oversees bus transportation; meets weekly with leadership team on matters of concern/decision making.
Boren, Krista	School Counselor	School Counselor: Provides training and support in the MTSS/Rtl process annually and as needed; works with teachers through the problem solving cycle; facilitates leadership meetings related to MTSS/Rtl; monitors scheduling of Educational Planning Team meetings; teaches students through classroom guidance lessons; is responsible for scheduling ESE meetings and 504 meetings; works with the Principal and/or Assistant Principal on issues of behavior; acts as a parent contact for parents who have academic and/or social concerns related to their child.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The faculty meet in various committees to discuss academic issues, social emotional practices, safety, best practices, and discipline that draws from and is then disseminated to grade levels and leadership. Monthly faculty meetings provide information and discussion about concerns and decisions made in the committees. Data is routinely shared in faculty and committee meetings. The School Advisory Council meets regularly to collaborate in school decisions. The School Leadership team meets weekly to discuss all issues happening in the school. All of the information collected from committees, faculty, staff, and SAC is added to the School Improvement Plan. The draft plan is shared with the same stakeholders for input and discussion.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Prior to each monthly faculty meeting, the school improvement goals are reviewed, comparing current data to previous data. Compiling the input from all the committees with the data collected, leadership will assess whether or not we, as a school are on track to meet our goals and what changes to implement if we are not. Progress and changes will be shared with all stakeholders via faculty and SAC meetings. Changes will be added to the School improvement Plan.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	85%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	32	20	21	25	13	0	0	0	111	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	18	21	21	19	12	0	0	0	91	
Course failure in Math	0	11	7	21	19	13	0	0	0	71	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	27	27	16	36	19	0	0	0	125	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	31	15	26	46	22	0	0	0	140	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	27	27	16	36	19	0	0	0	125	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	16	16	19	38	18	0	0	0	107

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	8	21	14	21	7	12	0	0	0	83	
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	2	15	24	38	12	14	0	0	0	105	
Course failure in Math	2	7	22	23	6	15	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	9	21	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	8	26	0	0	0	39	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	23	39	12	15	0	0	0	102	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	12	25	38	12	26	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	8	21	14	21	7	12	0	0	0	83	
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	2	15	24	38	12	14	0	0	0	105	
Course failure in Math	2	7	22	23	6	15	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	9	21	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	8	26	0	0	0	39	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	23	39	12	15	0	0	0	102	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	12	25	38	12	26	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47			54	53	56	51		
ELA Learning Gains				58	56	61	54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40	43	52	42		
Math Achievement*	43			57	55	60	45		
Math Learning Gains				66	58	64	44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38	46	55	32		
Science Achievement*	41			49	48	51	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	56			46					

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	232
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	18	Yes	4	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	20	Yes	2	1
HSP	53			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	55			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	28	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	51			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	41			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	47			43			41					56
SWD	21			10			17				4	
ELL	25			50							3	56
AMI												
ASN	58			75							2	
BLK	25			20			13				4	
HSP	59			44			60				5	50
MUL	58			65			50				3	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	55			51			59				4	
FRL	27			30			29				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	58	40	57	66	38	49					46
SWD	16	39	39	22	56	45	7					
ELL	13	50		33	75							46
AMI												
ASN	69	73		77	91							
BLK	30	44	38	35	47	27	28					
HSP	50	61	40	50	67		40					
MUL	62	73		69	80							
PAC												
WHT	69	63		69	76		67					
FRL	38	48	35	41	57	35	32					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	54	42	45	44	32	38					
SWD	24			25								
ELL	18			36								
AMI												
ASN	62			77								
BLK	36	45	10	23	30	10	27					
HSP	47			41								
MUL	48			48								
PAC												
WHT	65	58		63	55		50					
FRL	34	50	50	31	35	29	33					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	54%	4%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	49%	-6%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	52%	-12%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	54%	-5%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	51%	-9%	51%	-9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science is the component that showed the lowest performance. This category had a significant decline following COVID. The percent proficient in 2018-19 was 61%. After COVID this percentage dropped to 38%. This year, our percent proficient in science was 42%.

In an effort to help students following the pandemic, the school focus has been on literacy. Students received extra support in ELA across all subject areas. This decreased some of the time previously dedicated to science instruction.

For the coming school year, Science instruction will have a more protected time block. Increased focus

will be on authentic experiments and the use of scientific journals. Reading and writing will be infused into the science block with an increased focus on academic vocabulary.

Our school is also needing to focus on two subgroups: Black/African American and Students with Disabilities. Only 28% of Black/African American students and 21% of Students with Disabilities showed proficiency in ELA. The previous school year 30% of Black/African American Students and 16% of Students with Disabilities showed proficiency in ELA. When looking at math 24% Black/African American students and 9% of students with disabilities showed proficiency in Math. The previous school year 35% of Black/African American Students and 22% of Students with Disabilities showed proficiency in math. Both subgroups showed gains from Progress Monitoring 1 to Progress Monitoring 3 they did not show the same gains as their counterparts. All other subgroups showed proficiency about 41% in ELA and Math.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The greatest decline in data happened in third grade. This was consistent in ELA and Math. On the 2022 assessments 51% of third grade students were proficient in ELA and 52% of students were proficient in math. On the 2023 assessments, 43% of third grade students were proficient in ELA and 40% were proficient in math. When looking at data from the previous school year, this grade level started the year further behind than in previous years.

As a school, we decided to implement UFLI Foundations in third grade for all students. This decision was based on DIBELS data from the previous school year. While these students showed significant gains on DIBELS from the beginning of the year to the end of the year the results did not transfer to state assessment. Our students went from 56% of students at core or above in the DIBELS predominate measure to 60%. More significant is the we dropped from 33% of students being in intensive on the predominate measure to 25%.

In math we had 32 students identified as ready for accelerated math. Students in accelerated math showed high achievement on the FAST. Students working on grade level did not show the same level of proficiency. This shows the need for an evaluation of the tier 1 math curriculum in third grade.

Also significant to note is the decline in math proficiency for students with disabilities. Math proficiency for this subgroup from 22% to 9%. There was inconsistency in the teachers for students with disabilities in the intermediate grades with the teacher retiring in January. There also appears to be a misalignment between Tier 1 instruction in math and supplemental support provided by the ESE teacher. This shows a need to focus on instruction for Students with Disabilities.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Third grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. In third grade 40% of students showed proficiency in math as compared to the state average of 59%. Our students performed 19 percentage points below state average. 32 students participated in accelerated math and showed high achievement on the FAST. Students working on grade level did not demonstrate the same level of proficiency, especially when compared to the state average.

One of the main contributing factors is the inconsistency in teachers for math. The grade level started the school year over enrolled. A teacher was hired three weeks into the school year to help lower class size and provide extra support for students in regular third grade math. The teacher resigned approximately three weeks later. There were multiple teachers in the classroom from mid October to the end of December when a permanent teacher was hired. Inconsistent instruction led to gaps in learning for particularly students who were not on grade level at the start of the year.

Other contributing factors to the lower math scores in third grade were the new benchmarks, curriculum, and pacing. The teachers had a difficult time adjusting instruction indicating the need for more support in the implementation of tier 1.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Students across the school showed the most growth on DIBELS data. As a school on the composite and predominate measure for each grade level we went from 57% of students in core or above to 65%. This data reflected students' mastery of basic reading skills including phonics and oral reading fluency. As a school, we implemented UFLI Foundations in grades K-3. This program focuses on basic skills for encoding and decoding. In grades 4 and 5, we implemented the SIPPS program. This program focused on decoding, particularly multisyllabic words. We also implemented a school wide fluency program. Each grade level had targets associated with automaticity, rate, intonation/affect, and prosody. Teachers received coaching on implementing UFLI, SIPPS, and the school based fluency program throughout the year. In addition to a change in tier 1 instruction, students in Title 1 also received extra support in reading foundational skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

In reflecting on the EWS, fourth grade had more students with two or more risk indicators than other grade levels. Fourth grade has 38 students with two or more early warning indicators. There are 36 students with a level 1 on the ELA and 46 students with a level one in math. In planning for the 2023-24 school year, support for retained third grade students and incoming fourth grade students will be critical. Tier 1 instruction and intervention in math and ELA will be essential to the success of students. Priority will need to be given when scheduling to students with disabilities. This subgroup is under performing as is Black/African American subgroup.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

The school has three critical priorities for the upcoming school year. The first priority is to strengthen the tier 1 instruction for ELA, math, and science. This will include a focus on standards based instruction. The second priority will be on providing intervention to student with deficiencies in ELA and math. Particular attention needs to be payed to the subgroup data specifically for Black students and students with disabilities. The third priority will be on building and maintaining a positive culture and environment. This area is of particular concern for students with disabilities and black students as both of these subgroups have more discipline offenses and lower attendance rates. The relationships built with students will be critical to improving both attendance and classroom behavior.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Last school year, our students generated 486 discipline referrals and an additional 204 behavior offenses. 49% of the total offenses generated were by Black/African American students and 44% of the total offenses were by students with disabilities. The majority (74%) of referrals were mainly coming from the classroom. This supports the need for us to reexamine our classroom behavior practices. Our area of focus will be on building and maintaining a positive culture and environment by implementing PBIS and restorative practices.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of discipline referrals and behavior offenses will decrease by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

The discipline committee will review the monthly discipline data including number of referrals and offenses by subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Annie Harris (harrisal@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS will be implemented as a way to build a positive school culture. Through PBIS, students will be explicitly taught Norton expectations and positively rewarded/celebrated when following them.

Restorative Practices will also be used in classrooms to build relationships and community. This includes student and teacher have conversations about mistakes and and behavioral transgressions. These conversations focus on learning to recognize how and why students to make the certain choices, positive or negative. Students learn to become accountable for their actions, develop empathy, and to take steps to make amends to those who may have been effected.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that when PBIS is implemented properly, the PBIS multitiered framework results in improved student outcomes including lower school dropout rates, higher student engagement, decreased behavior problems, and academic progression.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Faculty and staff will receive professional development on restorative practices. This training will include rationale for implementation of Restorative practices related to last year's data, steps for implementation, and ways to promote classroom community and relationships between students as well as teachers.

Person Responsible: Annie Harris (harrisal@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 9, 2023

Walk throughs will be conducted to determine classroom efficacy of Restorative Practices after the initial training. The use restorative language and evidence of relationship building will be assessed.

Person Responsible: Annie Harris (harrisal@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: October 4, 2023

There will be follow-up trainings for Restorative Practices, once it is determined what the level of successful implementation has been achieved. These trainings may include review of initial training and steps of implementation. The training may also include delving deeper into the principles of restorative practices and examples.

Person Responsible: Annie Harris (harrisal@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: November 1, 2023

Faculty and staff will receive professional development on PBIS. This will include instruction on the schoolwide expectations, reinforcers and rewards.

Person Responsible: Bevon James (jamesbg@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 9, 2023

The PBIS committee will meet monthly PBIS to discuss efficacy of the program by way of current behavior data review.

Person Responsible: Bevon James (jamesbg@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September 1, 2023 through May 31, 2024

Walk throughs will be conducted to determine if PBIS strategies are being conducted with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Bevon James (jamesbg@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September 1, 2023 through May 31, 2024

Faculty and staff will receive coaching for PBIS implementation based on walk-through and discipline data.

Person Responsible: Bevon James (jamesbg@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September 1, 2023 through May 31, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The percentage of students identified as achieving at or above grade level in ELA, math, and science indicate the need for stronger tier 1 instruction. 50% of students achieved at or above grade level in ELA. 45% of students achieved at or above grade level in math. 42% of students achieved at or above grade level in science. Of special consideration is the percent of Black/African American students and students with disabilities achieving at grade level or above. Black/African American and Students with Disabilities. Only 28% of Black/African American students and 21% of Students with Disabilities showed proficiency in ELA. When looking at math 24% Black/African American students and 9% of students with disabilities showed proficiency in Math. Both of these subgroups are significantly underperforming when compared with their peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

1. All subgroups will show a 5% increase in the number of students achieving grade level proficiency in ELA and math to achieve this goal.
2. All subgroups will achieve an ESSA Federal Index of 41%.
3. All teachers will use core curriculum for tier 1 instruction 95% of the time as measured through instructional walk through data.

Monitoring:

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

The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Instructional Coach will meet regularly in leadership data chats to review walk through data and student achievement data. School trends will be shared with the faculty. Individual teachers will receive coaching support as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will receive direct instruction using core curriculum tied to Florida's Standards and Benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Interventions were selected based on their effective size from Visible Learning by John Hattie.

Direct instruction has an effect size of 0.59.

Direct math instruction has an effect size of 0.61.

Comprehensive reading programs have an effect size of 0.59.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 receive school and district inservice on identifying standards/benchmarks and developing learning targets. Learning targets and standards/benchmarks will be posted on focus boards in all classrooms.

Person Responsible: Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 9, 2023

Students will receive direct instruction using core curriculum tied to Florida's Standards and Benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 9th through May 31st

Teachers will participate in data chats based on grade level and classroom data. Data will be compared to school and district averages. Standards in need of reteaching will be identified and a plan for re-teaching developed. This will be a continuous cycle.

Person Responsible: Tristin Ballentine (ballentinetl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 9th through May 31st

The leadership team will conduct weekly walk throughs, then meet monthly to review data. School level trends will be identified. Teachers will be provided specific PD based on trend data in monthly faculty in-service meetings as identified on the school calendar.

Person Responsible: Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August through May

Individual coaching support will be provided based on student assessment data and walk-through observations.

Person Responsible: Tristin Ballentine (ballentinetl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August through May

Teachers will meet weekly as grade level teams to identify Standards and Benchmarks for the upcoming week. Teachers will discuss strategies and lesson structures to use for implementation. Team meeting notes will be submitted to administration for review.

Person Responsible: Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August through May

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Review of current school level data indicates that 125 students currently have a substantial reading deficiency. This shows the need for intensive intervention in the area of reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Fifty percent of students in the bottom quartile in ELA will show gains on FAST.

Monitoring:

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

The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Title 1 Instructional Coach will meet regularly in data chats to review progress of students. Adjustments will be made to tiered supports as needed based on current data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elena Mayo (mayoea@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students identified as having a substantial reading deficiency will be provided direct instruction using an intervention program. Students with noted deficiencies in phonics, fluency and/or decoding, will be placed in UFLI, SIPPS, Orton Gillingham, or Great Leaps. Students with deficiencies in reading comprehension will be placed in Achieve 3000.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Interventions were selected based on their effective size from Visible Learning by Jon Hattie. Direct instruction has an effect size of 0.59.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 receive on-going training, coaching, and support on tiered academic interventions.

Person Responsible: Tristin Ballentine (ballentinetl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Ongoing

Students will be identified using DIBELS and FAST data as having a substantial reading deficiency. Targeted students will be placed in intervention groups with a Title 1 teacher or ESE teacher.

Person Responsible: Tristin Ballentine (ballentinetl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September 22, 2023

The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Title 1 Instructional Coach will meet monthly with teachers in data chats to review student progress. EPT and/or IEP meetings will be scheduled for students not making satisfactory progress. Interventions will be adjusted accordingly.

Person Responsible: Tristin Ballentine (ballentinetl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Ongoing August to May

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The principal and district (support Principal or executive director) will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Federal Grants and programs department will aid in the budget alignment processes to ensure the student needs are met.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Our instructional practices in grades K through 2 will include the following:

1. Implementation of the district core curriculum- Benchmark Advanced
2. Implementation of UFLI Foundations during tier 1 instruction
3. Use of UFLI Foundations, Orton Gillingham, Great Leaps, and SIPPS during intervention as called for by individual student data.
4. Use Istation computer based resources

Using all of these instructional materials, we will be able to target the components of reading while ensuring that we are teaching the grade level benchmarks. Data from the FAST, DIBELS, and common assessments will guide the teacher on the focus for each individual student.

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

Our instructional practices in grades 3 through 5 will include the following:

1. Implementation of the district core curriculum- Benchmark Advanced
2. Implementation of SIPPS during tier 1 instruction
3. Use of UFLI, Great Leaps, and SIPPS during intervention as called for by individual student data.
4. Use of Achieve and Istation computer based resources

Using all of these instructional materials, we will be able to target the components of reading while ensuring that we are teaching the grade level benchmarks. Data from the FAST, DIBELS, and common assessments will guide the teacher on the focus for each individual student.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

For the 2022-2023 school year 35% of kindergarten students, 42% of first grade students, and 27% of second grade students were below the 40th percentile on FAST. Our goal for the 2023-24 school year is for less than 30% of students in kindergarten through second grade score below the 40th percentile on FAST.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

For the 2022-2023 school year 55% of third grade students, 43% of fourth grade students, and 51% of fifth grade students scored below a level 3 on FAST. Our goal for the 2023-24 school year is for less than 45% of students in third through fifth grade score below a level 3 on the FAST in ELA.

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Students in grades K-5 will take the FAST three times per year. Teachers will also administer the DIBELS assessment three times per year. Additionally, students will take 10 ELA concept assessments and weekly SIPPS quizzes. All of this data will be shared with the Principal, the Assistant Principal, and the Instructional Coach in either a district platform or through Google Docs. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and/or the Instructional Coach will meet monthly with grade levels and/or individual teachers to

plan for instruction based on current data. This will impact student outcomes because the instruction will be focused on where the students are currently excelling as well as struggling.

This data will also be shared with the literacy leadership team to allow for discussions on school based trends and planning for next steps.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ballentine, Tristin, ballentinetl@gm.sbac.edu

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Teachers will provide direct standards based instruction to all students in K-5 using district adopted core materials. This instruction will be supplemented by school identified intervention resources that target individual components of reading. All teachers will establish clear goals for instruction using a Focus board which identifies standards/benchmarks and the specific learning target for the lesson.

The leadership team will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs. This will provide individual data along with school wide trends in instruction. Teachers will be provided with feedback and when appropriate actionable next steps.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All students require high quality Tier 1 instruction directly connected to the grade level standards in addition to supplemental instruction. Hattie has identified Direct Instruction as a practice with the "Potential to Considerably Accelerate" with an effect size of .59.

All teachers will use a comprehensive reading program. Hattie has identified Direct Instruction as a practice with the "Potential to Considerably Accelerate" with an effect size of .59.

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
Norton Elementary has a Literacy Leadership team led by the School Principal, the Assistant Principal, and the Instructional Coach. The Literacy Leadership team consists of one representative from each school team and the family liaison. This team meets monthly to review school data, review current school literacy instructional requirements, and plan for school wide literacy initiatives.	Mayo, Elena, mayoea@gm.sbac.edu
Teachers will receive school and district inservice on identifying standards/benchmarks and developing learning targets. Learning targets and standards/benchmarks will be posted on focus boards in all classrooms. Students will receive direct instruction using core curriculum tied to Florida's Standards and Benchmarks. Teachers will participate in data chats based on grade level and classroom data. Data will be compared to school and district averages. Standards in need of reteaching will be identified and a plan for re-teaching developed. This will be a continuous cycle. Instructional coach will support teachers based on classroom data and walk through data.	Mayo, Elena, mayoea@gm.sbac.edu

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is reviewed and provided input through multiple stakeholders including the School Advisory Council (SAC), parents/families, teachers, and staff. It will be disseminated to stakeholders in a variety of ways.

The SIP will be shared with the School Advisory Council (SAC) who meets throughout the year to discuss school improvement. The council is made up of three teachers, three career service employees, three parents, three community members and the school principal. They also provide input and suggestions on school initiatives and actively participate in setting school goals.

It will be shared with families through PTA meeting(s), the school website, the Title I Annual Meeting, and committee meeting. The school staff will receive the information in school faculty meeting(s) and team leader meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school strives to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders while keeping all parties engaged in the school community. At the start of the year, families are welcomed to campus during Meet the Teacher, Open House and the Title I Annual Meeting. During these events, parents visit student classrooms, gain knowledge in how Title I supports all students, and learn about their child's upcoming school year.

Daily communication with families is maintained through the use of the Parent Communication folder funded by Title I. In 2nd - 5th grades, planners, also provided by Title I, are used to assist students in being organized, establishing routine, as well as communicating important information with parents and teachers. Weekly or monthly newsletters are sent home at each grade level, informing parents of important upcoming dates, standards the students are working on, and goals for subject areas.

Teachers will invite parents to campus for parent-teacher conferences throughout the school year. These may be held on campus, via zoom, or by phone to keep parents informed of their child's progress. The family liaison will communicate with families and help support in student needs.

The school's Title I Family Engagement Plan is shared near the beginning of the year with all families. Parent & Family Engagement events are funded by Title I and designed to connect families and community stakeholders with the school. Events range from Publix Math night, where students apply real-world math skills with their families, to family workshops focusing on a variety of topics including B.E.S.T. Standards and transitioning to middle school.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) meets throughout the year to discuss school improvement. The council is made up of three teachers, three career service employees, three parents, three community members and the school principal. They also provide input and suggestions on school initiatives and actively participate in setting school goals.

School clubs and performances are another opportunity for family and/or community involvement. The math club has local competitions that are open to families. Girls on the Run participates in a community run where school staff and families come out in support of students. The Ukulele Club, Chorus and all grade level music classes, host various evening performances inviting families to attend as well.

All parents are invited to join and attend PTA. The PTA hosts multiple events throughout the year in partnership with various community businesses including Trunk or Treat, STEAM Night and the school carnival.

The school is open for families who may want to run alongside their student during Morning Mile or have lunch with their student on campus. The school also hosts three awards ceremonies during the school year to recognize students, which are open to families. Awards are presented for attendance, leadership, and academics.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

The Literacy Leadership Team will continue to support and remain a driving force for reading instruction and growth for the entire school. The team is promoting literacy in a school-wide initiative to build interest and connection to reading across grade levels. The school has also established individual committees for both Math and Science, to focus on subject area knowledge while supporting the school's goals. Teachers in grades K-2 will implement UFLi to continue growth in foundational reading skills. A decoding component will be included for grades 3-5 using SIPPS, to build fluency and automaticity in reading skills. Thinking Maps, funded by Title I will be reviewed and integrated into instruction throughout the year to provide all students a visual pattern and base for deeper understanding.

Last year, Accelerated Math began for the third grade students. This year, both third and fourth grades will offer an Accelerated Math class. This provides new opportunities for students for advanced math skills and real-world application in the future.

Title I intervention services will be provided to students in all grade levels through three Title I intervention teachers. Title I teachers will implement Orton Gillingham, UFLi Foundations, Achieve3000, and Everglades curriculum in small groups to help students in need of Tier 2 support.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan is written in conjunction with the school Title 1 coordinator. Title 1 does not coordinate with other federal programs.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Norton Elementary has a full time School Counselor and 2-day per week School Social worker who specifically provide Behavior Life Skills and support to students. They will follow the MTSS model through classroom lessons, small group meetings, theme days and weeks, individual counseling and referring to community resources. Building behavior life skills and wellness skills are an important aspect of child development to help students learn to effectively interact and work together. Tier 1 supports are implemented in every classroom through curriculum such as Sanford Harmony and OLVEUS, as well as other district approved curriculum. These classroom lessons and activities specialize in creating opportunities to develop social skills to aid in recognizing and preventing bullying.

The School Counselor and Social Worker work closely with the leadership team, family liaison, teachers, and parents/families to provide support to students during the school day as needed. Small groups are developed to work on social skills, emotional regulation and academic motivation. Open lines of communication to families are essential and utilized to provide updates on students progress, answer questions, and provide community resources. The School Counselor and Social worker work closely with families to provide outside referrals to community agencies as needed for ongoing and long term support for students.

Norton Elementary participates in “Start with Hello” Week in September. This is a national call-to-action week dedicated to helping students make connections and build community at school. Activities were held throughout the week in the school and within each classroom.

Norton Elementary will participate in Unity Day by wearing orange, to show that we are together against bullying and promote kindness, acceptance, and inclusion.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students’ access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

In preparation for post-secondary opportunities and the workforce, through the coordination of the school Guidance Counselor and the local community, the school has established a career day for students in grades K-5. Local community members, families and other stakeholders visit classrooms to share information about their company, job, education and skills required for success in their career. Additionally, Vehicle Day is an immersive experience for all students to learn more about vehicles, tools and careers necessary for their work.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We continue to implemented a tiered behavior system, based on Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS). The school wide model begins with a proactive approach surrounding our 4 school wide expectations: Be Respectful, Be Safe, Be Responsible, Be Cooperative. These are adapted and taught in all classrooms, with students learning what they mean in multiple situations. Students are reinforced for using these expectations in a variety of ways, with specific language, so students know what they have done to earn that praise. This is the Tier 1 model.

For students struggling or having difficulties understanding the expectations, the expectations are explicitly retaught and modeled. For students who may need increased support or scaffolding of the expectations, they may have reminders or value added for using them correctly by way of lists, charts or other individual prompts in the classroom to help them make those choices. Students may be encouraged to seek role models or adults to help them with this process. The growth or lack thereof will be documentation of the effectiveness of the intervention. This is the Tier 2 model.

For students with significant difficulties with understanding and following the schoolwide expectations, a more structures approach for guiding these students to success may be implemented. This may involve behavior plans with attainable goals and a check in-check out system with an adult both inside and outside the classroom. This system may break down the expectations into smaller pieces, making success more achievable and reinforcing growth. Making progress towards the goal will be celebrated, while teaching the student to reach for the next step, or larger goal. Each step of this process will be documented to ascertain if the intervention is helping the student move towards their goal of understanding and implementing the schoolwide expectations, or whether a different type of intervention is warranted. This is the Tier 3 model.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities in areas such as Thinking Maps, MTSS, the Learning Environment, and ICEL.

At the start of the year, teachers received professional development regarding the optimal learning environment and building classroom community. This training focused specifically on how the classroom environment impacts the learner. Additionally, teachers participated in professional learning surrounding the ICEL (Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner) framework, to provide a tool to consider all likely explanations which impact academic or behavioral success.

Professional development in the B.E.S.T. standards will continue to provide teachers a deeper understanding and relationship with the new standards and how they are connected across grade levels. Teachers will consistently participate in data chats as grade level teams, with the Instructional Coach and members of the leadership team, to review data and student progress from academic assessments.

Teachers and high dose tutors will be given initial or refresher UFLi training to implement phonics instruction with students. The Title I funded Instructional Coach works daily with teachers to ensure students needing intervention are receiving the appropriate programs, dose, and instruction to help them achieve academic success. Additionally, teachers will receive ongoing training on tiered academic interventions and how to best meet the instructional needs of all students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

In the spring, prior to the start of kindergarten, the school will host Kindergarten Round-Up. All potential kindergarten students are invited to come out for the afternoon. Kindergarten teachers provide the students with a snack, a brief activity, and a tour of the school. The Leadership team shares a short presentation outlining kindergarten expectations and information to families. Prior to the first day of school, all families, attend Meet the Teacher where students get to preview the classroom and meet new friends. On the first day of school, all kindergarten parents are invited to walk their student to class and help get them settled.

For students with disabilities, the ESE team schedules a meeting with incoming families. At this meeting, services are discussed along with any special considerations. The Individualized Education Plan is updated to reflect needs and any changes in services discussed.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention				\$287,043.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.6	\$155,024.94
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Salaries</i>			

	5100	210	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$21,036.88
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Retirement</i>			
	5100	220	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$11,859.41
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher SSI</i>			
	5100	230	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$27,113.60
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Insurance</i>			
	5100	290	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$790.63
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Early Retirement</i>			
	6400	130	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$49,848.30
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach Salary</i>			
	6400	220	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$6,764.41
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach Retirement</i>			
	6400	220	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,816.39
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach SSI</i>			
	6400	230	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$8,473.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach Insurance</i>			
	6400	290	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$254.23
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach Early Retirement</i>			
	5100	120	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,718.20
			<i>Notes: Lead Teacher Supplement</i>			
	5100	220	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$131.45
			<i>Notes: Lead Teacher SSI</i>			
	5100	510	0541 - C. W. Norton Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$211.56
			<i>Notes: Additional UFLI Materials- 36 pack of whiteboards dry erase markers and erasers - 10 sets 36 pack of double-sided dry erase lapboards - 10 sets Page Protectors</i>			
Total:						\$287,043.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No