

St. Lucie Public Schools

Northport K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| 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 | 28 |

Northport K 8 School

250 NW FLORESTA DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/10/2023.

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Rustay, Glenn | Principal | |
| Cash, Lisa | Assistant Principal | |
| Evbuowan, Herenta | Other | |
| Butterworth, Elizabeth | Graduation Coach | |
| Farr, Laurie | Math Coach | |
| Nieves, Melody | Teacher, ESE | |
| Lankow, Diana | Reading Coach | |
| Wilson, Lorena | Reading Coach | |
| Elliott, Angela | Dean | |
| Guzman, Deanna | Teacher, K-12 | School Assessment Coordinator |

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 School Advisory Council (SAC) is actively engaged in the School Improvement Process. Meetings are scheduled for the second Wednesday of each month. School Messenger invitations are sent prior to each meeting inviting parents and community members to attend, either in person or virtually. Each

subgroup of stakeholders is represented, and new members are voted on by peers. Participants are invited to discuss and provide feedback on items pertaining to school-based programs and policies.

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))

The SIP is discussed during Leadership Team meetings. Implementation of identified strategies is monitored for efficacy. Data from FAST testing is analyzed and used to determine if revisions are necessary. Particular emphasis will be placed on Students With Disabilities and the need to meet the Federal Index threshold of 41%.

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) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 77% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 78% |
| 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 | 8 | 31 | 35 | 21 | 29 | 21 | 41 | 66 | 62 | 314 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 20 | 53 | 59 | 169 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 5 | 18 | 12 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 24 | 17 | 88 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 7 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 29 | 5 | 65 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 17 | 6 | 8 | 40 | 39 | 63 | 68 | 67 | 308 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 21 | 18 | 36 | 39 | 36 | 84 | 51 | 68 | 353 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 5 | 25 | 30 | 39 | 33 | 38 | 72 | 79 | 64 | 385 | |

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 | 1 | 28 | 36 | 36 | 47 | 86 | 96 | 96 | 426 |

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 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 31 | 34 | 66 | 72 | 88 | 409 | |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 19 | 60 | 39 | 63 | 208 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 27 | 15 | 0 | 60 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4 | 29 | 16 | 0 | 69 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 39 | 65 | 61 | 73 | 276 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 44 | 55 | 56 | 58 | 91 | 332 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 102 | 88 | 109 | 306 | |

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 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 46 | 50 | 106 | 97 | 117 | 434 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 31 | 34 | 66 | 72 | 88 | 409 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 19 | 60 | 39 | 63 | 208 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 27 | 15 | 0 | 60 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4 | 29 | 16 | 0 | 69 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 39 | 65 | 61 | 73 | 276 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 44 | 55 | 56 | 58 | 91 | 332 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 102 | 88 | 109 | 306 |

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 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 46 | 50 | 106 | 97 | 117 | 434 | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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* | 39 | 50 | 53 | 42 | 53 | 55 | 43 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 48 | | | 45 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34 | | | 32 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 42 | 51 | 55 | 42 | 41 | 42 | 40 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 48 | | | 39 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47 | | | 35 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 38 | 52 | 52 | 39 | 50 | 54 | 41 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 62 | 71 | 68 | 76 | 55 | 59 | 69 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 69 | 75 | 70 | 69 | 50 | 51 | 53 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 90 | 74 | | 50 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 69 | 53 | | 74 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 33 | 44 | 55 | 56 | 78 | 70 | 47 | | |

** 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 | 45 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 317 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 501 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| 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 | 21 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 31 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 23 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| BLK | 42 | | | |
| HSP | 44 | | | |
| MUL | 45 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | | | |
| FRL | 41 | | | |

| 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 | 31 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 41 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 47 | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |
| MUL | 56 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | | | |
| FRL | 48 | | | |

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 | 39 | | | 42 | | | 38 | 62 | 69 | | | 33 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 23 | | | 12 | 29 | | | 6 | 15 |
| ELL | 26 | | | 30 | | | 17 | 54 | | | 6 | 33 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 17 | | | 28 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 34 | | | 38 | | | 33 | 57 | 77 | | 7 | 30 |
| HSP | 39 | | | 40 | | | 39 | 60 | 74 | | 7 | 35 |
| MUL | 49 | | | 39 | | | 41 | 50 | | | 4 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | | | 52 | | | 45 | 74 | 61 | | 6 | |
| FRL | 35 | | | 37 | | | 33 | 58 | 65 | | 7 | 31 |

| 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 | 42 | 48 | 34 | 42 | 48 | 47 | 39 | 76 | 69 | | | 56 |
| SWD | 15 | 33 | 34 | 19 | 37 | 39 | 17 | 47 | | | | 42 |
| ELL | 28 | 46 | 35 | 35 | 42 | 29 | 27 | 70 | | | | 55 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 43 | 50 | | 43 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 44 | 27 | 37 | 46 | 44 | 31 | 74 | 82 | | | 48 |
| HSP | 41 | 48 | 32 | 42 | 48 | 41 | 33 | 75 | 70 | | | 63 |
| MUL | 48 | 47 | | 55 | 59 | | 69 | 60 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 52 | 47 | 47 | 49 | 68 | 49 | 83 | 62 | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 45 | 32 | 38 | 47 | 49 | 34 | 73 | 69 | | | 56 |

| 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 | 43 | 45 | 32 | 40 | 39 | 35 | 41 | 69 | 53 | | | 47 |
| SWD | 19 | 38 | 28 | 17 | 31 | 26 | 18 | 50 | | | | 29 |
| ELL | 31 | 46 | 40 | 32 | 47 | 38 | 26 | 83 | | | | 47 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 58 | | | 67 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 35 | 32 | 30 | 35 | 37 | 23 | 54 | 33 | | | 45 |
| HSP | 43 | 47 | 36 | 39 | 37 | 29 | 43 | 76 | 57 | | | 47 |
| MUL | 38 | 33 | | 46 | 38 | | 33 | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 53 | 25 | 50 | 47 | 41 | 58 | 74 | 63 | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 41 | 27 | 38 | 38 | 32 | 37 | 67 | 46 | | | 46 |

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 | 38% | 46% | -8% | 54% | -16% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 43% | -5% | 47% | -9% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 43% | -3% | 47% | -7% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 48% | 52% | -4% | 58% | -10% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 42% | -4% | 47% | -9% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 42% | -13% | 50% | -21% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 48% | 1% | 54% | -5% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 25% | 38% | -13% | 48% | -23% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 52% | -12% | 59% | -19% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 56% | -15% | 61% | -20% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 43% | 7% | 55% | -5% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 48% | -15% | 55% | -22% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 41% | -1% | 44% | -4% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 47% | -15% | 51% | -19% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 71% | 34% | 37% | 50% | 21% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 39% | * | 48% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 61% | 0% | 66% | -5% |

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.

The lowest performance was in ELA Proficiency, with 39%. This constitutes the lowest performance in ELA since prior to 2015.

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

ELA proficiency continues to decline, posting 39% proficiency. The highest performance was 51% in 2019, pre-COVID. Transitioning to new standards and new textbooks are factors contributing to the significant loss of proficiency.

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.

State average proficiency was 53%. With a score of 39%, this constitutes a decrease of 14%age points. Again, transitioning to new standards, new textbooks, and remote/in-person learning are factors contributing to the significant loss of proficiency.

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

Although Math BQ Learning Gains jumped from 35% in 2021 to 47% in 2022, the goal set for 2023 was not met. Strategies employed to meet this goal included the addition of a K-5 Math Coach, as well as increased CLPs targeting Math.

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

The number of Level 1 students in ELA increased from 276 to 322, while the Level 1 Math students decreased from 322 to 305. Attendance improved from 409 students with more than 10% absences to 314.

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

ELA BQ Learning Gains
Math BQ Learning Gains
Attendance
Reading Proficiency grades K-5

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Students at all grade levels identified as part of the subgroup Students With Disabilities continue to score well below their peers, scoring 31% on the Federal Index in 2022-2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, the Federal Index for Students With Disabilities will increase by 10% to meet the threshold of 41% as measured by FAST assessments.

Monitoring:

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

BEST standards will be monitored through data from FAST progress monitoring, iReady in K-5, Imagine MyPath, and Savvas Successmaker in 6-8, Unit Assessments, District Tests, and FAST PM. AGPRs may also be used to measure progress toward IEP goals. Areas of need will be retaught to improve proficiency within the standards of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Herenta Evbuowan (herenta.evbuomwan@stlucieschools.org)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Analysis of subgroup data indicates Students With Disabilities are not achieving at the same rate as their non-disabled peers. This strategy meets the needs of students with Education Plans and Individual Education Plans.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

Master Schedule will reflect the availability of classes according to the needs of the Students With Disabilities.

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

By When: Completion of schedule 08/2023.

TSA for ESE and School-based ESE Specialists will monitor instruction and ensure procedural safeguards.

Person Responsible: Brittany Rampone (brittany.rampone@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Support Faciliators will be trained to use Really Good Reading for students in need of additional direct instruction in phonics.

Person Responsible: Herenta Evbuowan (herenta.evbuomwan@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Training complete by October 1, 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

An Area of focus for the 2023-24 school year is student attendance. This was identified through analysis of the data. The Average daily Attendance ranged from a low of 91.32% in Kindergarten to a high of 95.15% in Fourth grade. This constitutes an average of 92.63% for all students in PK through eighth grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, Average Daily Attendance for all students in grades PK through eighth will be 94%, as measured by SkyWard.

Monitoring:

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

Average Daily Attendance is monitored through reports developed by PowerBI. These reports are delivered daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

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.)

Evidence-based interventions include incentivizing individuals and whole groups, School-wide PBIS, and school counselor/social worker contact for targeted students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence points to improved attendance when interventions occur.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

Monitoring of average daily attendance

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

By When: ongoing through June 2024

The Attendance Committee meets monthly to analyze the effectiveness of interventions utilized.

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

By When: ongoing through June 2024.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

There will be a focus on the implementation of quality Tier 1 Instruction. The rationale for this focus is a decrease in proficiency from 42% (FSA) to 39% as measured by FAST. As this was the baseline implementation year for FAST, there is no available data for Bottom Quartile Learning Gains. Performance in ELA has not yet regained levels experienced pre-COVID.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-24 school year, general education teachers, as well as teachers of students with disabilities, will participate in focused collaborative learning and planning (CLP) meetings with their respective grades/teams. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons using BEST standards and best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will result in 60% of ELA students in the bottom 25%ile demonstrating learning gains as measured by FAST testing.

Monitoring:

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

Assigned administrators will participate in CLPs on a weekly basis. Lesson plans will be monitored for pacing and adherence to SLPS Scope and Sequence. Fidelity Checks will be conducted, with results analyzed and action plan developed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Cash (lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org)

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.)

Benchmark Advance K-5
 Leveled Literacy Intervention Tier 2 and Tier 3, K-5
 Savvas My Perspective 6-8
 The Writing Revolution 6-8
 Imagine MyPath 6-8

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has indicated that explicit instruction in text-based writing and reading comprehension will increase proficiency, resulting in increased learning gains.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

Provide professional learning in standards-based instruction, data-driven lesson design, differentiation, and the CLP process

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

By When: ongoing through 6/2024

Utilize District Supports available through Teaching, Learning, and Leading

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

By When: ongoing through 6/2024

Focus on implementing Tier 1 Instruction using district-approved curriculum

Person Responsible: Lorena Wilson (lorena.wilson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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 area of focus will be implementing quality Tier 1 instruction in Math using district-approved curriculum with fidelity. The rationale for this is we continue to lag behind our 2019 proficiency of 58% (FSA) with 42% proficient as measured by FAST, administered in Spring 2023. As this was the baseline implementation year for FAST, there is no available data for Bottom Quartile Learning Gains. Performance in Math has not reached pre-COVID levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, general education teachers, as well as teachers of students with disabilities, will participate in focused collaborative learning and planning (CLP) meetings with their respective grades/teams. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons using BEST standards and best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will result in 60% of Math students in the bottom 25%ile demonstrating learning gains as measured by FAST testing.

Monitoring:

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

Assigned administrators will participate in CLPs on a weekly basis. Lesson plans will be monitored for pacing and adherence to SLPS Scope and Sequence.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Glenn Rustay (glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org)

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.)

Quality instruction has the most significant impact on student achievement. Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction in small groups to increase achievement in Math.

Savvas Math is used in K-8

iReady

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated instruction is a high-effect size strategy that allows teachers to work with small groups of students to instruct them at their level of learning and targeted skills.

Savvas Math 6-8

Reading K-5

Savvas Successmaker 6-8

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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 analyze data to identify their lowest 25%ile and students near proficiency.

Person Responsible: Laurie Farr (laurie.farr@stlucieschools.org)

By When: This will occur by the end of September 2023.

Professional Learning based on Savvas Successmaker (6-8) and IXL(Algebra and Geometry) will be delivered to facilitate the use of digital resources.

Person Responsible: Glenn Rustay (glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org)

By When: This will occur by the end of October 2023.

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 School Advisory Council approves expenditures related to school improvement funding. Requests are made through SAC, and members agree on allocations. Purchases must pertain to one or more of the Areas of Focus as identified in section III of the SIP. The PTO also plays an important role in providing guidance from the community on expenditures. Partnership with district resources is critical. District administrator specially assigned to oversee grants will be involved in compliance, as well as the district curriculum department, which will fund approved resources. The district Title I staff, including the Federal and Special Programs Manager and the Title I Coordinator will assist the school with planning budgets and parent involvement events.

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

As measured by Early Literacy or STAR Reading, 68% of kindergarteners and 53% of first graders were considered proficient in 2023. An increased emphasis on foundational skills and small group instruction

contributed to this upward trend. Of the students in second grade, 48% were considered proficient as measured by Early Literacy or STAR Reading.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 31% of third graders, 47% of fifth graders, and 38% of fifth graders were proficient as measured by FAST ELA. An area of focus is standards-based instruction. A review of the data indicates the need for a laser focus on identifying critical elements of the BEST standards, as well as increased use of the gradual release model and small group 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 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

By the end of the 2023-24 school year, a minimum of 51% will show proficiency in kindergarten, first grade, and second grade as measured by FAST Early Literacy and STAR Reading.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, a minimum of 51% of students in third, fourth, and fifth grade will demonstrate proficiency in ELA as measured by FAST Progress Monitoring.

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.

Monitoring of focus areas will occur weekly through literacy rounds conducted by the administration and literacy coaches. Administration attends CLPs in each grade level. Coaches conduct fidelity checks for the pacing of the core curriculum and monitoring of tiered interventions. Unit Assessment data, iReady usage and data elements , and PM data will be used to monitor for the desired outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cash, Lisa, lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org

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?

Tier 1 instruction is provided through the use of Benchmark Advance, which is on the state adoption list. Heggerty will be used in Kindergarten classrooms for phonemic awareness; Heggerty does not meet strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence. Tiered intervention is provided using Leveled Literacy Intervention (Strong), Imagine (Promising) is used with ELL students and iReady (Promising) is used by all students. These resources are aligned with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and align with the BEST ELA Standards.

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?

Research regarding LLI indicates significant differences in Non-Word Fluency and Oral Reading Fluency. Data gathered during the 2022-2023 school year indicates strong performance in all areas, with student performance and measured growth higher than in previous years.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Progress monitoring of literacy instruction will be ongoing. The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly and consists of administration and members from different grade levels and assignments. The Team is tasked with reporting the strengths/weaknesses of strategies shared. Topics include progress on the pacing of the Tier 1 curriculum and progress of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Literacy coaches and admin will conduct regular literacy rounds. | Cash, Lisa, lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org |
| The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly and consists of administration and key members of the instructional staff. The Team is tasked with reporting the strengths/weaknesses of strategies shared. Topics include progress on the pacing of the Tier 1 curriculum and progress of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Literacy Coaches and admin will conduct regular walkthroughs for fidelity checks. | Cash, Lisa, lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org |
| Professional Learning will be made available to all instructional staff to address learning needs in standards-based instruction and small-group instruction. This will include further professional learning on the CLP process, which will increase the effectiveness of planning for instruction. | Cash, Lisa, lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org |

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 is available on the school's website. Access instructions are published in the monthly newsletter, which is available digitally via email and the website.
<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/npk/staff/>

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))

Monthly activities are planned to educate the community, including parents, families, and other stakeholders, in the programs and curriculum that fulfill the mission of Northport K8. As outlined in the PFEP, informational segments are intertwined with enjoyable family events such as Hispanic Heritage Night, Bingo for Books, Trivia Night, and Bingo for Books.
<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/npk/staff/>

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))

Northport provides an accelerated curriculum for our students scoring Level 3 or higher, particularly in Math. The Rising Stars program for grades K-5 serves students determined to be gifted or in need of enrichment in a self-contained setting. The Northstars Team, serving grades 6 - 8, provides advanced and accelerated classes for the same demographic.

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))

NA

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))

na

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))

na

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).

na

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))

na

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))

na

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

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

No