

The School District of Desoto

Nocatee 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	31
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	34

Nocatee Elementary School

4846 SW SHORES AVE, Nocatee, FL 34268

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

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.

The mission of NES is to prepare all students to be successful citizens and productive workers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of NES is that all students will be confident learners and respected leaders.

School Leadership Team, 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
Tackett, Brandy	Principal	Monitoring all areas of focus.
DeGlopper, Melinda	Instructional Coach	Provide Coaching support; Assist with monitoring the implementation of Focus Areas
Farmer, Dionna	Assistant Principal	Monitor all areas of focus

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.

Teachers, families and administrators were involved in providing input to the Nocatee Elementary School Improvement Plan for 2023-2024 school year. The plan was drafted by the principal, assistant principal, academic coach, and grade level representatives.

The draft was submitted to all stakeholders for input and feedback. Revisions were made and then distributed for review. The final plan was submitted to Nocatee Elementary staff for approval and implementation. The implementation of the plan will be monitored by the Building Instructional Leadership Team.

The School Advisory Council assists in the annual preparation and monitoring of our School Improvement Plan.

The implementation of Nocatee Elementary's School Improvement Plan shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet state academic standards.

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 purpose of our school improvement plan is to guide our school improvement problem-solving and planning process throughout the year and help identify and organize strategies and resources that will lead to increased student achievement at Nocatee Elementary.

Nocatee staff, to include the principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor (TBD), classroom and ESE teachers participate in quarterly school-based data meetings whereby student progress is monitored. ESSA groups are viewed collectively to ensure that we are making acceptable progress across all subgroups. Action steps for subgroups or individual students is determined and resources are allocated accordingly. During subsequent data meetings, student data, interventions and enrichment opportunities are reviewed. Non-student specific data is presented to our SAC committee for further analysis and input. Action steps are continuously reviewed and support initiatives are adjusted as necessary.

Ongoing walkthrough data with targeted "Look For's" will be utilized to ensure that our instructional focus initiatives are consistently implemented. Coaching Cycles and Campus Professional Development will be adjusted based on "Campus" need for Continuous School Improvement.

Our DeSoto County District Support staff along with our Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent will participate in quarterly VIEW walks with school-based administration and our Instructional Leadership team to analyze data at the teacher and grade level. During our Nocatee VIEW walks, we will monitor our School Improvement Goals and walk classrooms to determine the percentage of implementation that is observed. School-based Professional Development/Coaching support will be adjusted accordingly. These VIEW walks will also inform district level Professional Development offerings.

MTSS systems are in place to ensure that student data is routinely viewed for all learners. Support staff allocation and tiered intervention is aligned based on various data points in addition to the quarterly Progress Monitoring data. Additional data that will be collected and considered may include: teacher observation, attendance, behavior, parent concern, pediatrician input, formative assessments, portfolio of work, etc.

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	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI

Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	25	14	23	26	12	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	22	12	36	11	6	0	0	0	87	
Course failure in Math	0	4	11	33	6	3	0	0	0	57	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	17	19	0	0	0	64	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	6	19	0	0	0	54	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	24	20	26	10	10	0	0	0	90	

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	11	10	7	22	10	0	0	0	60

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	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	7	12	13	16	14	6	0	0	0	68	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	3	3	1	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	0	17	7	14	6	5	0	0	0	49	
Course failure in Math	0	9	5	11	1	5	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	14	24	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	11	16	0	0	0	45	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	9	28	39	15	26	0	0	0	121	

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	4	11	14	23	18	23	0	0	0	93

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	11	14	23	18	23	0	0	0	93

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	26	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	36	53	31	34	56	25		
ELA Learning Gains				42			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			43		
Math Achievement*	42	45	59	36	43	50	29		
Math Learning Gains				44			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			50		
Science Achievement*	35	29	54	10	39	59	20		
Social Studies Achievement*					45	64			
Middle School Acceleration					44	52			
Graduation Rate					24	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	57	59	57			41		

** 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	210
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	1
ELL	28	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	40	Yes	2	
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	45			
FRL	40	Yes	2	

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	3	1
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	33	Yes	1	
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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			35					57
SWD	14			11			0				5	55
ELL	18			34			23				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			43							2	
HSP	35			44			38				5	56

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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			42			39				4	
FRL	35			39			39				5	57

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	31	42	40	36	44	48	10					57
SWD	16	35	33	28	48	50	13					40
ELL	21	33	28	21	40	41	3					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			29								
HSP	32	44	35	36	41	38	11					56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	32	36		40	51		8					
FRL	29	42	41	35	44	44	11					53

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	25	43	43	29	41	50	20					41
SWD	9	43		12	50		9					17
ELL	16	31		25	34		8					41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	50		39								
HSP	24	39	42	30	35	50	5					40
MUL	15			23								
PAC												
WHT	27	50		27	46		45					

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
FRL	22	40	47	31	45	56	21					36

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	41%	35%	6%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	48%	4%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	33%	0%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	40%	10%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	29%	10%	51%	-12%

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 data that showed the lowest performance, consists of the following:

1. There was an overall decline in 3rd grade for both Math and ELA proficiency.
2. There continues to be a significant gap when compared to state proficiency levels for Math and ELA in grades 3-5.
3. Students with disabilities and our black student population have fallen below the Federal Index of 41% in both ELA and Math for 3 consecutive years.
4. Nocatee Elementary's black student population has fallen below 26% proficiency in both ELA and Math for 1 year.
5. Nocatee Elementary's ELL student population has fallen below 32% proficiency in both ELA and Math for 1 year.

A contributing factor was the introduction of new B.E.S.T. Standards and a breakdown in standard literacy amongst teachers. Common Planning was built into the schedule and Professional Development had begun, but the impact of the Professional Development was not fully observed during the 22-23 school year. There was an overall lack of alignment with standards to include instruction, task alignment, and depth of complexity.

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

3rd grade Math proficiency scores showed the greatest decline, falling 16% overall from 49% to 41%.

This past year there was a lack of standard alignment to the instruction delivered. The depth of complexity required for students to demonstrate proficiency was a missing component of daily instruction.

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.

A significant gap exists between school performance and state performance averages in 3rd grade ELA proficiency and in 3rd grade Math proficiency.

41% of Nocatee Elementary 3rd graders were proficient in Math, compared to the state average of 59%. This is a 36% gap in performance.

33% of Nocatee Elementary 3rd grade students are reported proficient in ELA compared to state averages of 50%. This is a 41% gap in performance.

A contributing factor was lack of standard knowledge with teachers and lack of standard and task alignment with instruction.

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

Nocatee Elementary demonstrated 32% growth in ELA proficiency overall and data is showing a positive trend with the last 3 years proficiency scores reported at 25%, 31%, and 41% respectively.

Nocatee Elementary demonstrated 28% growth in overall Math proficiency, which also shows a positive trend with the past 3 years in Math proficiency scores reported at 29%, 36%, and 46% respectively.

While 5th grade Science scores are still significantly below state averages, there was a 270% improvement from last year. Nocatee Elementary reported only 10% of students proficient in science during the 21-22 school year and 37% of Nocatee 5th grade students are reported as proficient during the 22-23 school year.

Nocatee Elementary and DeSoto County Schools work with the Florida Bureau of School Improvement. District VIEW visits and BSI Instructional Review walks during the 22-23 school year were used to inform district level professional development and associated supports.

Actions taken during the 22-23 school year included ensuring that common planning was occurring with instructional coaching support twice weekly.

Staff participated in a Professional Development Plan targeting trends identified by walkthrough data as follows:

- 20 school-based
- 30 district-based
- 30 personal portfolio

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

100 of our presently enrolled 459 students have attended school less than 90% of the time. This equates to 22% of our student population missing 10% or more of their daily instruction.

90 of our presently enrolled 459 students in grades 1-5 show a substantial reading deficiency on 22-23 PM 3 of STAR Literacy requiring urgent intervention.

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

1. Standard and Instructional Alignment.
2. ESSA Subgroups- outcomes for multiple subgroups.
3. Positive culture and environment specifically related to teacher retention.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

During the 22-23 school year, NES had 3 Instructional Review visits. These visits were attended by the 22-23 Nocatee Principal and Assistant Principal, Assistant Superintendent, District Director of Student Services, School-based ELA Coach, and 3 support personnel from the Bureau of School Improvement.

The data compiled in the final Instructional Review visit is as follows:

-In 16% of the classes, there was alignment between instruction and grade level benchmark. In 50% of the classrooms visited, there was 50% alignment and in 33% of all classrooms walked, there was no alignment observed between instruction and standards.

-Full alignment was not observed between the task that students were being asked to do and the grade level benchmark in any classroom. There was partial alignment in 67% of classrooms walked. In 33% of the classrooms walked, there was no alignment at all between the task and the grade level benchmark.

There continues to be a significant gap when compared to state proficiency levels for both Math and ELA in grades 3-5, which can be largely correlated to this lack of standard alignment.

ELA Proficiency

3rd Grade 33% / State 50%

4th Grade 52% / State 58%

5th Grade 41% / State 54%

Math Proficiency

3rd Grade 41% / State 59%

4th Grade 48% / State 61%

5th Grade 50% / State 55%

Science Proficiency:

NES 39% / State 51%

(B.E.S.T.) standards were developed by Florida experts, educators, and stakeholders. The standards provide effective instruction in foundational skills, knowledge, and curriculum. Aligning learning to standards ensures that higher level learning is attained; tasks and depth of complexity become targets for learning outcomes that correlate to a progression of knowledge that students must attain throughout their K-12 educational experience.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Full standard alignment will be observed in 75% of classrooms during instructional reviews, VIEW visits, and in administrative walkthroughs using a standard-alignment evaluation tool at the mid-year mark. Full alignment will be observed in 100% of classrooms during end-of-year walks.

On Spring 23-24 F.A.S.T. Assessment, we will report the following results:

-in ELA, NES will increase our ELA proficiency by 22%, improving proficiency from 41% to 50%. Additionally, we will report 60% in ELA gains and 60% in ELA LQ gains.

-in Mathematics, NES will increase our Math proficiency by 20%, improving proficiency from 46% to 55%. Additionally, we will report 60% in Math gains and 60% in Math LQ gains.

-in Science, NES will increase Science proficiency by 22%. Currently, 37% of students demonstrate proficiency in Science standards. 45% of students will demonstrate proficiency in Science standards as measured by Spring 23-24 F.S.A.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through VIEW walks, BSI Instructional Review walks, daily administrative walks using a common standard alignment walkthrough tool.

School leadership will review lesson plans weekly to provide feedback to teachers as they prepare to deliver instruction.

School Content Coach and administration will be present during weekly collaborative planning sessions to support the development of intentionally aligned instruction.

Weekly Leadership Team meetings will occur to discuss trends and adjust coaching support as needed.

Progress Monitoring Data will be utilized to measure effectiveness of tiered instruction throughout the 23-24 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

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.)

1. Instructional Coach and Leadership Team will build B.E.S.T. Standards literacy by engaging in BSI Conference and attending district and state supported professional development opportunities throughout the year for continued leadership growth.
- 2 Instructional coach will provide paraprofessional training during pre-planning and throughout the year on B.E.S.T. standards.
3. The Instructional Coach will facilitate subject area planning with grade level teams twice weekly with administrative presence to create cohesion of expectations with an emphasis on vertical alignment.
4. Classroom walks (10 per administrator each week) with specific feedback related to NES "look fors." Feedback provided on iObservation.
5. Task Alignment walkthrough tool will be utilized. Data will inform school-based professional development.
6. All staff have agreed, by MOU, to participate in additional Professional Development as it relates to Standards and Instructional alignment
7. Continuous Improvement meetings with Leadership Team to discuss instructional trends and coaching needs with coaching calendars utilized.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

New B.E.S.T. standards have been implemented and teachers' lack an understanding of these standards. As determined by the data outlined above, Instruction is not generally aligned, and often does not reflect the instructional skills needed to support students in meeting the demands of these new standards. Teachers need high quality Professional Development and coaching opportunities to support them in aligning their instructional practices to these new B.E.S.T. standards.

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.

Administration and Instructional Coach will attend BSI Summer Academy and will engage in additional B.E.S.T. Standards training to support the full implementation of standards school-wide.

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

By When: July 2023 and Ongoing

Instructional Coach, Administration, and District will provide foundational Professional Development during Pre-Planning to establish expectations for B.E.S.T. Standard implementation as well as framework for instruction.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: By August 2023

Instructional Coach will provide collaborative planning twice weekly to all grade level teams with administration presence.

Month 1 Focus (unpacking standards)

Tuesday- ELA

Thursday- Math

Month 2- shift to using coaching models for mathematical support

Tuesdays- ELA Unpacking standards

Thursday- ELA Teaching moves with rigor

Month 3 we will convene to evaluate the planning model and adjust accordingly.

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

By When: Ongoing. Month 3, evaluate system with Instructional Leadership Team to adjust as needed.

Classroom walks- 10 formally entered each week by each administrator in iObservation tool beginning the 20th day of instruction for teachers. Specific feedback will be provided as related to our Look Fors:

Standards Alignment

Differentiation

Bell to Bell Instruction

Checks for Understanding

Data will be housed in our walk through tool to evaluate the effectiveness of planning, collaboration, and data analysis. Dionna Farmer will be responsible for inputting walkthrough data daily.

Person Responsible: Dionna Farmer (dionna.farmer@desotoschools.com)

By When: Ongoing.

Increased participation in Professional Development. Teachers signed MOU to complete a minimum of 20 hours of PD related to Look Fors (SIP Goals.) Teachers met collaboratively to participate in data analysis and create a Focus for PD.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: Ongoing

Continuous Improvement Meetings will occur after each PM to look at learners and specifically black students, ELL students, and SWD students. This data will drive MTSS, tutoring groups, and intervention groups.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: Ongoing

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

On State Benchmark Assessments, students with disabilities and our black student population have fallen below the Federal Index of 41% in both ELA and Math proficiency for 3 consecutive years. Additionally, Nocatee Elementary's black student population has fallen below 26% proficiency in both ELA and Math proficiency for 1 year and Nocatee Elementary's ELL student population has fallen below 32% proficiency in both ELA and Math proficiency for 1 year.

The goal of ESSA is to provide all students a "significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps." By implementing systems for appropriately tiered small-group instructional support as well as systems for monitoring fidelity and student progress, we will see equitability amongst all subgroups and we will close achievement gaps.

Measurable Outcome:

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

41% or more of all students in the following subgroups will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and in Mathematics as measured by Spring (PM3) 23-24 F.A.S.T. Assessment:

Students with Disabilities

English Language Learners

Black Students

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through our Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, S.T.A.R. Assessments, Quarterly Data Meetings, Small-Group/Intervention fidelity checklists, and Intervention Attendance Logs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

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.)

1. All students will take the S.T.A.R. and F.A.S.T. baseline Assessment in August. Grade level data meetings, with instructional coach and administration present, will review data to determine how intervention and acceleration supports are allocated. Students will be aligned with a state-adopted tiered small-group intervention for both Reading and Math.
2. Strategic PD connected to Vocabulary instructional strategies for teachers.
3. Attendance logs will be kept to ensure that students are being provided small group/intervention regularly.
4. Multi-Tiered-Systems of Support will be utilized to monitor students' progress in assigned intervention or acceleration. A student's response to intervention will dictate how and when interventions need to be adjusted.
5. Administrative walkthroughs and checklists will be kept to ensure intervention is occurring with fidelity to practice, frequency and curriculum utilized.
6. Leadership Team will meet weekly to include the Instructional Coach to adjust instructional support as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

John Hattie has done a synthesis of over 800 meta-analysis and compiled a rank order of instructional influences that impact student achievement, which is referred to as an "effect" size. In his meta-analysis, any factor that has an "effect" size of greater than .40 has a significant impact on student achievement. Small group instruction has an effect size of .49 indicating that this has a significant influence on student achievement.

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.

Administration of STAR and FAST Assessment to gather baseline data in August with 100% student completion rate.

Person Responsible: Dionna Farmer (dionna.farmer@desotoschools.com)

By When: August 21st

School Improvement Meeting to analyze baseline data following administration and then following every administration thereafter.

Teachers will meet with administration, Guidance and instructional coach to place every child on a data card. Cards are Red, Yellow, Green, Blue. Students are then placed on a wall chart in connection with their designated color. Black students, SWD, and ELL students will be tagged with a colored dot as to continue to track specific subgroup data.

Tiered interventions/acceleration and MTSS procedures will be followed based on data collected. Attendance logs will be collected.

Tiered students will be monitored for growth using DIBELS. Tiered supports will be adjusted accordingly.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: Week of August 21st

Professional Development specifically targeting Vocabulary Strategies and best instructional strategies will be incorporated across PD's

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

By When: Ongoing

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support will be utilized to monitor students progress in assigned intervention and acceleration. A student's response to intervention will dictate how and when intervention or acceleration support needs to be adjusted.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: Ongoing

Fidelity Checklists will be utilized to determine fidelity of small group intervention with regard to teaching routines.

Attendance Logs will be monitored for fidelity of schedule.

Person Responsible: Dionna Farmer (dionna.farmer@desotoschools.com)

By When: Ongoing

Leadership Team to meet weekly to discuss walkthrough trends, fidelity documents, and observations to adjust campus-wide supports.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: Weekly every Friday at 1:00 p.m. to be attended by administration, guidance, and instructional coach.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Teachers work best when they are in an environment in which they feel safe, supported, challenged, and accepted. Research shows that when schools and districts focus on improving school climate, teachers are more likely to engage in collaboration, develop positive relationships, and demonstrate positive behaviors.

Ensuring that a culture of collaboration and involvement is created will increase the likelihood that teachers feel invested in this work and take ownership in their own personal development as well as ownership for student data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Alignment between standards and instructional practices will be observed in 60% of all classrooms by the end of the 1st quarter; 75% of all classrooms by the end of the second quarter, and 95% of all classrooms by the Spring of 24.

Climate surveys will demonstrate improvement in overall moral. Staff will report improved communication and involvement with decision making by the Spring of 2024.

100% attendance for all teams/instructional personnel will be met for all School Improvement Data Meetings (3 per year following Progress Monitoring.)

Attendance records for PD will show more than 95% attendance by instructional staff for all Professional Development opportunities.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will run School Improvement Data Meetings after each round of Progress Monitoring. There will be 100% staff attendance for these meetings. Attendance logs will be maintained.

Week of August 21, 2023

Week of January 15, 2024

Week of May 20, 2024

Attendance logs will be kept for all Professional Development. There will be 95% staff attendance for all PD.

August 24th – 2:30-4:00

Sept 7th – 2:30-4:00

Sept. 21st – 2:30-4:00

Oct. 5th – 2:30-4:00

Nov. 9th- 2:30-4:00

Dec. 7th- 2:30-4:00

Jan. 25th- 2:30-4:00

Feb. 8th- 2:30-4:00

Feb. 22nd – 2:30-4:00

March 28th – 2:30-4:00

April 11th- 2:30-4:00

April 25th - 2:30-4:00

May 9th – 2:30-4:30

School walkthrough tool will be utilized to see alignment between instructional practice and standards. Improvement will be driven by PD plan. If improvement is observed, this indicates greater buy in to SIP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

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.)

Involving teachers and staff in collective decision making for school improvement-

1. Teachers were strategic in pre-planning to analyze school-wide data/SIP and trends and to identify a learner-centered problem and a problem of practice that is within our control.
2. Teachers participated in creating a list of PD needs related specifically to this problem of practice.
3. Coherence for all PD with alignment to our School Improvement Plan and Look Fors.
4. Teachers will participate in quarterly school improvement meetings to discuss student/school data once available to help the school reflect on and use the data for improvement and planning.
5. Paraprofessionals will participate in instructional professional development to build capacity and to support instruction and learning.
6. Use of climate surveys to determine school-wide needs will be given at least twice a year.
7. Teacher Mentor program for all new teachers. District expectation and support will be provided.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

New incoming administrator completed a survey at the end of the 22-23 school year assessing what staff felt were opportunities for growth. Staff reported improved communication and participation in decision-making as opportunities for growth.

Teacher morale can be improved by creating a collective vision with shared goals. Creating this shared vision will help develop trust, which is important to school improvement (Erichsen & Reynolds, 2020). Engaging staff in whole-school decision making, data analysis, and professional learning opportunities (Morris et al., 2020) will ensure that everyone understands best professional practice. This practice builds a sense of trust and commitment to the continuous model for school improvement.

Research shows that when schools support mentoring programs for teachers, there are benefits for the mentee, mentor, and the school. Participation in a mentoring program can increase teacher morale leading to teacher retention thereby potentially leading to an improvement in the academic performance of students.

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 attend pre-planning meeting whereby they analyze school-wide data and discuss instructional trends. Teachers work collaboratively to identify a Learner-Centered problem and then work to find a

problem of practice. Teachers will participate in identifying a professional need and a PD plan will be created around this.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: Week of August 10th, 2023.

All Professional Development will be cohesive and align with School Improvement Plan and targeted Look For's:

Standard/Task Alignment

Differentiation

Bell to Bell Instruction

Checks for Understanding

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: 20 hours at minimum

Teachers will participate in quarterly School Improvement meetings to review data specific to individual students.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: Week of August 21st Week of January 15th Week of May 20th

Paraprofessional to participate in instructional Professional Development at the school and district level to support small group instruction and intervention.

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

By When: Ongoing

Climate Surveys will be given out 2 -3 times per year to gauge overall moral and staff satisfaction.

Person Responsible: Brandy Tackett (brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com)

By When: Ongoing

District created Teacher Mentor program. Teacher involvement with adherence to meetings and required supports. Stipend supported initiative.

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

By When: Ongoing

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).

Students representing subgroups will be tracked for achievement. Resource allocation will be determined based on need. Students identified in these subgroups will be targeted for intervention with trained personnel. Additionally, tutoring opportunities will target our black student population, SWD's, and ELL's as a primary focus. Instructional resources and supplies will be allocated accordingly to intervention groups and tutoring groups.

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

On the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Assessment, Kindergarten reported 58% of learners and 1st grade reported 54% of learners as not being on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

The Area of Focus to target this critical need is ELA Standard Alignment across all grade levels. In addition, we are implementing UFLI Foundations, an explicit and systematic program that teaches students the foundational skills necessary for proficient reading. This program is aligned to the Science of Reading as well as DeSoto County K-12 Reading Plan. This will also be utilized as an intervention resource as necessary.

An additional Area of Focus is systematic Progress Monitoring of tiered learners with aligned interventions.

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

On the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Assessment, 3rd grade reported 67% of learners and 5th grade reported 59% of learners as not being on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

The Area of Focus to target this critical need is ELA Standard Alignment across all grade levels. (B.E.S.T.) standards were developed by Florida experts, educators, and stakeholders. The standards provide effective instruction in foundational skills, knowledge, and curriculum. Aligning learning to standards ensures that higher level learning is attained; tasks and depth of complexity become targets for learning outcomes that correlate to a progression of knowledge that students must attain throughout their K-12 educational experience.

An additional Area of Focus is systematic Progress Monitoring of tiered learners with aligned interventions.

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

Kindergarten reported 42% proficiency in ELA during the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Assessment. We will see growth of 19% and increase our overall proficiency to 50% on the 2024 Spring F.A.S.T.

First grade reported 46% proficiency in ELA during the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Assessment. We will see growth of 20% and increase our overall proficiency to 55% on the 2024 Spring F.A.S.T.

Second grade reported 52% proficiency in ELA during the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Assessment. We will see growth of 15% and increase our overall proficiency to 60% on the 2024 Spring F.A.S.T.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Third grade reported 33% proficiency in ELA during the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Assessment. We will see growth of 52% and increase our overall proficiency to 50% on the 2024 Spring F.A.S.T.

Fourth grade reported 55% proficiency in ELA during the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Assessment. We will see growth of 9% and increase our overall proficiency to 60% on the 2024 Spring F.A.S.T.

Fifth grade reported 39% proficiency in ELA during the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Assessment. We will see growth of 28% and increase our overall proficiency to 50% on the 2024 Spring F.A.S.T.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored through VIEW walks, BSI Instructional Review walks, daily administrative walks using a common standard alignment walkthrough tool.

MOU Professional Development logs will be maintained to ensure teachers attend Professional Development as required.

Weekly Instructional Leadership Meetings will be attended by Administration, Intervention teacher, and instructional coach to discuss instructional trends and specific instructional needs necessary for continued improvement.

Teachers will participate in 2 collaborative planning sessions each week with instructional coach to work on task/standard alignment.

Continuous Improvement Meetings will occur after each PM to look at literacy proficiency and growth and identify how students are progressing and to connect them with appropriate interventions.

Tier 2 and tier 3 students will have weekly DIBEL or Easy CBM Reading Inventory completed and tracked to demonstrate whether they are experiencing growth or need their intervention adjusted.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tackett, Brandy, brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com

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?

UFLI K-2:

UFLI Foundations, an explicit and systematic program that teaches students the foundational skills necessary for proficient reading, which is aligned to the Science of Reading, will be implemented in all K-2 classrooms as a core instructional resource. Additionally, this will be utilized as an intervention resource for all learners K-5 as needed during their targeted intervention time. This program is a district initiative and therefore, aligns with the district comprehensive K-12 Reading Plan.

Standard Alignment/Coaching:

Evidence strongly suggests that a well-designed instructional coaching program improves teacher practice and student outcomes. Instructional coaching support that incorporates high-quality professional development are more likely to improve teacher practice. The Instructional Coach will facilitate subject-area planning with all ELA teachers during their common planning period on Tuesdays and Thursdays focusing on improving target/task alignment.

Progress Monitoring/Continuous Improvement:

When schools use systematic progress monitoring to track students' progress in reading they are better able to identify need and strategically align interventions.

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?

UFLI K-2:

Nocatee has lacked a systematic way of teaching reading foundations in grades K-2.

Standard Alignment:

The data compiled in the final Instructional Review from 2023 visit is as follows:

-In 16% of the classes, there was alignment between instruction and grade level benchmark. In 50% of the classrooms visited, there was 50% alignment and in 33% of all classrooms walked, there was no alignment observed between instruction and standards.

-Full alignment was not observed between the task that students were being asked to do and the grade level benchmark in any classroom. There was partial alignment in 67% of classrooms walked. In 33% of the classrooms walked, there was no alignment at all between the task and the grade level benchmark.

Progress Monitoring/Continuous Improvement:

There was no process for analyzing data holistically for Nocatee or for teachers to engage in the data analysis of individual learners. Students in need were identified only if a teacher would make the request for additional support. Intervention resources and personnel were not utilized to capacity.

The implementation of this instructional resource in grades K-2, along with these instructional systems will address the significant reading deficiency of learners K-5.

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
<p>Literacy Coaching/Professional Learning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The instructional coach will facilitate subject-area planning with all ELA teachers during their common planning period on Tuesdays and Thursdays focusing on improving target/task alignment. 2. A Task Alignment walkthrough tool will be utilized. Data will inform school-based professional development. 3. Instructional Leadership team meets weekly to discuss individual walkthrough data as well as overall trends and progress toward SIP goals. 4. All staff have agreed, by MOU, to participate in additional Professional Development as it relates to Standards and Instructional alignment 	<p>DeGlopper, Melinda, melinda.deglopper@desotoschools.com</p>
<p>Assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuous Improvement Meetings will occur after each PM to look at learners. This data will drive MTSS, tutoring groups, and intervention groups. Teachers, Guidance Counselor, Interventionist, Instructional Coach, and Admin will participate in all Continuous Improvement meetings. 2. Weekly Progress Monitoring using Easy CBM will be utilized to track interventions for learners in Tiers 2 and 3 to determine effectiveness of intervention. Adjustments will be made accordingly. 	<p>Tackett, Brandy, brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All K-2 teachers as well as intervention paraprofessionals attended UFLI implementation training during pre-planning. 2. UFLI resources and instructional kits were provided by the district to ensure that all teachers implementing this resource had the resources necessary to be successful. 3. The expectation for UFLI to be the ELA instructional Foundations Core in grades K-2 with monitoring of fidelity to practice in walkthrough tool. 4. Instructional Coach and Intervention Teacher will provide modeling and additional coaching support as needed for effective implementation. 	<p>Tackett, Brandy, brandy.tackett@desotoschools.com</p>

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.

Nocatee Elementary will disseminate the school-wide plan through our School Advisory Council, Title I Annual Meeting, Parent and Family Engagement Nights, and other informational sessions.

Our School Improvement Plan will also be posted to our school website: <https://nes.desotoschools.com/>

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))

Nocatee Elementary establishes open and regular communication channels with parents, families and community stakeholders. This includes maintaining an updated school website, sending newsletters, and utilizing communication platforms like Skylert, email, and social media platforms. Nocatee will schedule regular family engagement events, and parent conferences to educate families on community resources, student social and emotional needs as well as how to provide academic support at home. Nocatee will schedule regular School Advisory Committee meetings providing parents, educators, administrators and community members an opportunity to collaborate on school policies, programs, budgets and initiatives.

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)

Teachers will have regular opportunities for collaboration and professional learning communities to align standards and instruction, share effective teaching practices and discuss strategies for curriculum enrichment.

Teachers will regularly analyze assessment data to identify areas of improvement and adjust instructional strategies during our school improvement meetings after each round of Progress Monitoring. During these School Improvement meetings to analyze data, all students requiring acceleration and/or intervention will be placed in a differentiation/intervention group accordingly.

Small Group/Differentiation will occur daily for all students in ELA and Math. Additional paraprofessional supports will be integrated into ELA blocks in grades 3-5 daily.

Full implementation of UFLI phonics-based program will be utilized in grades K-2 as a phonics core reading program. Additionally, this resource will be used as needed for intervention support based on student need. District has included paraprofessionals in PD during pre-planning.

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))

All aspects of school improvement maximize funding from Federal, State, and local services for student achievement. All decisions related to funding are made in collaboration with district support personnel. As appropriate, input from staff, SAC, and stakeholders is sought.

We work to align resources and programs with families at the school level, district and community level. This includes Title I, ESOL and Migrant Programs, ESE Pre-K, nutrition and health/medical programs, and other supports as needed.

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))

School District of DeSoto County offers counseling opportunities to our students. DeSoto County increased the number of social workers and mental health counselors to provide students with counseling services.

Parents can complete a Counseling Referral Form from our district website or school and submit it to the guidance counselor, social worker, or mental health counselor. All screenings are conducted by school-based mental health staff. Please note that your child will never be screened without your consent. A hard copy of this referral form was sent home with each student to ensure that families were made aware of available emotional and mental health support.

Nocatee Elementary School has over 80% of our staff trained in Youth Mental Health and First Aid.

A student Ambassador program that focuses on Leadership and supporting campus needs is available for 4th and 5th graders.

Nocatee Elementary also has the following after-school clubs twice weekly as overall enrichment outside of standard academics:

Art Club
Science Club
Girls on the Run
Good News Club
Garden Club
Band

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))

Ensuring that students are proficient in B.E.S.T. standards will prepare them for opportunities in the workforce; which may include career and technical education programs as well as ensure that they have a foundation so that they are able to access post-secondary coursework while they are still in high school.

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).

The PBIS model for Nocatee is new and staff and students are engaging in understanding consistent school-wide expectations for behavior. Additionally staff is working to understand how to incentivize positive behaviors. Expectations for behavior are posted throughout the school. Quarterly rewards are provided for students who remain in Tier 1 for behavior expectations.

Our MTSS process includes opportunities to review student discipline data and referrals to align interventions according to student need. Administration, Guidance, Teachers, and family will work in

collaboration for students in Tier 2 to provide additional interventions aligned to the student behavior, antecedent, and motivator.

Tier 3 will be supported by District Behavior Specialists. Tier 3 interventions, Behavior Intervention Plans will be created and monitored for students who need additional supports.

Progress Monitoring of all tiered interventions will be ongoing.

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))

A Professional Development plan was created with staff input after analyzing trend data and identifying a learner-centered problem as well as a problem of practice. Teachers will participate in 20 hours of targeted PD aligned to SIP.

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))

At Nocatee, we serve the needs of ESE Pre-K. Our teachers focus on transition activities and strategies that promote self-regulation by helping children know what to expect and actively participate in their daily schedule. They also promote an understanding of the sense of time and help with the development of social-emotional skills. Pre-K participates in school-wide activities as relevant to developmental needs. There is a 4:12 adult/student ratio in our Pre-K class to ensure students have the support they need.

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: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$204,416.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,317.94
			<i>Notes: Supplies and materials, such as paper, copies, pencils, markers, highlighters, training binders and books, etc., for all professional development and after-school work within the school for turnaround work</i>			
	5100	129	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$76,800.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers and instructional coaches will be required to attend designated professional development and school turnaround meetings, not to exceed 80 hours. Teachers and instructional coaches will receive a stipend of \$2,400 as compensation for the additional time required by these scheduled professional development or turnaround meetings to be paid following the 40th scheduled hour, and the second half no later than May 31, 2023. Per MOU- 32 Teachers and instructional Coaches @ \$2,400= \$76,800</i>			
	5100	220	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,875.20
			<i>Notes: Social Security for stipend for extra planning time 7.65%</i>			

	6400	130	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.7	\$39,868.50
			Notes: 1 ELA academic coach- 70% Salary-\$39,868.50 Benefits-\$ 9,048.48			
	6400	220	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,049.94
			Notes: Social Security- 7.65%			
	6400	230	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$592.37
			Notes: Group Insurance			
	6400	210	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,406.17
			Notes: Retirement- 13.56%			
	6400	130	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.83	\$47,106.70
			Notes: 1 math academic coach- 83% Salary-\$47,106.70 Benefits-\$ 24,399.43			
	6400	220	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,603.66
			Notes: Social Security- 7.65%			
	6400	210	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$6,387.67
			Notes: Retirement- 13.56%			
	6400	230	0181 - Nocatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$14,408.10
			Notes: Group Insurance			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$0.00
Total:						\$204,416.25

Budget Approval

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

Yes