

Okeechobee County School District

North 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

North Elementary School

3000 NW 10TH TER, Okeechobee, FL 34972

<http://northelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.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.

North Elementary School will create a learning environment in which teachers and parents work together to enable each student to realize his/her potential. The school and its faculty will provide students with the best resources and instruction possible in order for them to be successful both in school, and later in life as thriving members of our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together: Achieving excellence, putting students first!

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
Briney, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Williams, Rachel	Instructional Coach	
Robinson, Tuuli	Principal	
Bockoras, Candace	Instructional Coach	

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.

Draft SIP will be presented to the SAC during the first meeting, scheduled for September 14, 2023.

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))

Student data is closely monitored throughout the year, with a specific emphasis on students' attendance, grades, and performance on state assessments. Instructional adjustments are made as needed, to meet students' needs through modifying Tier 1 instruction, as well as, revisiting the Tier 2 and Tier 3 needs for students in ELA and Math.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	40	39	21	20	17	30	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	3	7	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	13	28	7	7	6	4	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	4	14	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	14	18	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	21	22	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	33	22	18	14	18	0	0	0	119
STAR ELA Urgent Intervention	14	33	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
STAR Math Urgent Intervention	26	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	8	15	2	1	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	4	39	26	17	21	24	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	0	1	9	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	10	32	24	4	2	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	5	1	8	4	2	2	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	5	24	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	16	31	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	32	24	12	5	24	0	0	0	107

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	8	14	11	14	8	19	0	0	0	74

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	21	7	14	2	0	0	0	0	54
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	4	39	26	17	21	24	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	0	1	9	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	10	32	24	4	2	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	5	1	8	4	2	2	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	5	24	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	16	31	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	32	24	12	5	24	0	0	0	107

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	8	14	11	14	8	19	0	0	0	74

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	21	7	14	2	0	0	0	0	54
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	50	56	65	52	57
ELA Learning Gains	56	56	61	56	54	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26	42	52	57	55	53
Math Achievement*	50	52	60	71	62	63
Math Learning Gains	40	52	64	68	57	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30	45	55	56	42	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	45	42	51	49	44	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	43			59		

* 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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	346
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	15	Yes	1	1
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				

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%
BLK	13	Yes	1	1
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	39	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)

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	56	56	26	50	40	30	45					43
SWD	10	18	11	18	11	6	0					42
ELL	37	46	29	39	35	19	15					43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	10		8	10							
HSP	44	47	23	41	33	24	27					43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	67	33	59	48	41	59					
FRL	50	53	30	40	35	34	33					40

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	57	41	20	60	22	26	36					45
SWD	27	35		29	13		26					47
ELL	43	33	17	54	27	42	29					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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			45								
HSP	54	42	14	58	22	38	37					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	38		60	21		33					
FRL	48	40	20	57	21	18	38					41

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	65	56	57	71	68	56	49					59
SWD	47	44	56	49	48	33	25					47
ELL	49	43	57	67	69	56	28					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	61		42	61							
HSP	54	47	54	66	69	54	34					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	62	60	77	70	60	65					
FRL	56	54	63	63	60	47	39					60

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	51%	43%	8%	54%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	57%	0%	58%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	41%	14%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	52%	10%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	56%	3%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	42%	3%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	42%	4%	51%	-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.

5th grade ELA and Math
 All 5th grade teachers were new to their grade level. It is difficult to pinpoint other factors that contributed to the low scores.

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

5th grade ELA scores declined by 11%.
 The factors are described in the previous field.

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.

5th grade ELA (5%), and 5th grade Math (11%)
 The factors are described in the previous field

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

3rd and 4th grade math

We believe that strong teachers for the particular subject area contributed to the higher improvement. Good collaboration among teachers also may have contributed to better instructional outcomes and students' learning.

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

Students' attendance and course failure in ELA

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

1. Standards based instruction
2. Improved instructional practices that align with the district's vision for effective instruction
3. Teacher collaboration through PLC

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

Positive culture is a focus area in our district's strategic plan. Positive work environment leads to higher teacher attendance as teachers want to come to work. Lower turnover allows for teachers to become more comfortable with practices and procedures, developing experts in each content area and grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Instructional staff turnover rate will be reduced from 27% to 10%.

Classified staff turnover rate will be reduced from 16% to 10%.

Overall leave rate will reduce from 24% to 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Frequent check ins with grade levels

Informal observations of culture around the school

Retention and Recruitment outcome data and comparative review at the end of the year to measure effectiveness

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)

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.)

"Leader in Me" to empower each individual to feel important and valued. This initiative focuses on recognizing unique aspects of each staff member and allowing leadership opportunities where people show initiative.

"Turtle Time" as a known way to uplift one another when needed. This initiative builds on the theme that was introduced at the PLC at Work conference, and again at the beginning of the year faculty meeting with an emphasis on noticing the difficulties that team members may have, and help them to get back on their feet through support, positive notes, and affirmations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

NES leadership team attended a summer learning conference and collectively agreed that empowering one another and building relationships is an effective morale booster.

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.

NES Committee Sign ups to solicit buy in from all staff; new committee leads selected to allow leadership opportunities for all

Person Responsible: Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Introduction of Turtle Time during pre plan to set the stage for a positive and supportive climate around the school. Staff activity to promote positive note writing to one another (notes available by the sign in sheets). Turtle Time theme visible around the campus, as a reminder of the importance of working together as a team.

Person Responsible: Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Initial introduction of Turtle Time - August 2023 Implementation - throughout the year

Instructional Staff Support through weekly planning, meaningful DPP goals, and individualized supports through coaching cycles

Person Responsible: Rachel Williams (rachel.williams@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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.

Specific instructional practices and instruction reaching the depth and rigor of the standard can have a higher impact on students' learning. Helping teachers to select and implement these strategies can lead to higher student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Instructional walkthrough data indicates 90% alignment with the appropriate benchmark according to our pacing guide with reasonable flexibility allowed.

Rating for student engagement and instructional delivery on instructional walk throughs are rated 3 or higher, 90% of the time.

Improved student learning outcomes on STAR and FAST assessments, as compared to 2022-2023 data.

Monitoring:

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

Two district level instructional rounds and two school-level instructional rounds with data collection are conducted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Participation in PLCs once a week, with instructional coaches and team facilitators.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on Hattie's research, collective teacher efficacy is the strategy with the highest impact on students' learning.

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.

Weekly PLCs are scheduled and promoted to allow structured discussions on instructional benchmarks

Person Responsible: Candace Bockoras (candace.bockoras@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Each week

PLCs focus on instructional benchmarks in ELA, Math, and Science, and answer 4 essential PLC questions, to aid instructional planning for the upcoming week

Person Responsible: Candace Bockoras (candace.bockoras@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Instructional Deliberate Practice Plans are crafted to specifically address instructional strategies to support indicators 4, 5, 6, 7, or 10 on the Instructional Evaluation to support student engagement, gradual release, standards based instruction, differentiation, or formative assessment and feedback practices

Person Responsible: Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Initial planning meeting with all instructional staff by September 20, 2023 Follow up with teachers and feedback on progress ongoing, through instructional evaluations Mid year progress monitoring in January, 2024

#3. 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.

Subgroups (ELL, Hispanic, African American) continue to underperform, as compared to the White subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All subgroups will improve their performance in all subject areas by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

State progress monitoring data (FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3) is used to monitor students' learning outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tuuli Robinson (robinsont@okee.k12.fl.us)

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.)

- Improved Tier 1 instruction
- Small group support
- Targeted support through MTSS
- Scheduled intervention time with ELL paraprofessionals

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct instruction and response to intervention (MTSS) are within the zone of desired effects on Hattie's high impact strategies (above impact of 0.4).

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.

Instructional planning through weekly PLCs to support Tier 1 instruction in ELA, Math, and Science (reaching the depth of the intended benchmarks, materials selection, task clarification)

Person Responsible: Rachel Williams (rachel.williams@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Data chats with individual teachers each quarter to monitor students' progress:

- 1st data chat upon completion of PM1 - initiation of needed Tier plans in ELA and Math
- 2nd data chat late fall to monitor students' progress on their Tier plans
- 3rd data chat after completion of PM2 (winter) to include revision of students' Tier plans as needed;

individual data chats with parents (APTT)

4th data chat mid spring to review students' progression towards intended goals; parent meetings with students who have not met their goals

Person Responsible: Tuuli Robinson (robinson@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Small group structure is implemented in classrooms to allow MTSS support, independent work to allow time for independent practice, and use of computer-based programs (Lalilo, Freckle), to provide on path as well as teacher assigned practice in ELA and Math

Person Responsible: Rachel Williams (rachel.williams@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily

Additional ESOL support through two ESOL paraprofessionals

Person Responsible: Heather Briney (heather.johnson@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily

Strategic ESE scheduling and support

Person Responsible: Jeanne Myers (jeanne.myers@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Schedules in place by August 31, 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).

NES does not receive school improvement funds this year. Any additional funds that are available or become available throughout the year are spent to improve instruction either via

a) additional human resources and support (instructional coach, paraprofessionals), or

b) supplemental instructional resources.

Input on how to spend funds is asked from the families at the Title I Annual Meeting.

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

K-2 does not fall under RAISE criteria based on our school data.

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

Focus:

Instruction is based on grade level benchmarks. PLC process is used to ensure collaborative planning to enhance common knowledge about the benchmark specification at each grade level. Lesson planning, instructional delivery, and assessment is focusing on the depth, as well as, the limitations of the benchmarks in question.

Rationale:

50% of students in grade 5 did not perform at level 3 or higher on the 2022-2023 FAST ELA assessment. This is a concern as 50% of students are entering the middle school years not proficient in reading which can consequently hinder access to future learning in all subject areas.

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

K-2 does not fall under RAISE criteria based on our school data.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

5th grade FAST ELA performance will improve by 5% to match the state average.

Grades 3 and 4 will maintain high performance on the state assessments (above 50%).

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.

- Classroom observations to evaluate alignment of daily instruction to grade level benchmarks
- Participation in PLC work that focuses on the 4 PLC questions, and benchmark specifications
- Analysis of students' data after each progress monitoring (PM1, PM2)
- Revision of small group instruction and MTSS supports based on progress monitoring data
- MTSS fidelity checks

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Robinson, Tuuli, tuuli.robinson@okee.k12.fl.us

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?

Positive culture

- When people feel positive about their work environment, they are more likely to become more comfortable to be knowledgeable about practices and procedures, and become experts in their content area.

Instructional practices specifically relating to PLCs

- Deliberate planning of instruction that reaches the depth and rigor of the benchmarks that has a high impact on students' achievement

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?

Based on Hattie's high impact strategies, collective teacher efficacy is the strategy with the highest impact on students' learning as well as on culture and climate within the school.

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>Establishment of a Literacy Leadership Team to include content area experts who are willing to share their expertise. The team will be established at the start of the school year. Literacy coaches will guide the work of the team, and extend support to classrooms through coaching cycles. Students' assessment data will be reviewed monthly to guide instruction and PD needs.</p>	<p>Williams, Rachel, rachel.williams@okee.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>MTSS plans are revisited upon availability of new data to ensure that students' needs are being met. Literacy Leadership team will consider and select appropriate progress monitoring tools. Literacy coaches identify the needs of students based on assessment data and write MTSS tier plans to meet those needs. Teachers are trained by Literacy Coaches to implement research based interventions.</p>	<p>Bockoras, Candace, candace.bockoras@okee.k12.fl.us</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.

The draft SIP will be presented to the NES SAC on September 14 during our first scheduled SAC meeting. The SIP is also available on NES website at <http://nes.okee.k12.fl.us/> under School Accountability section. The availability of SIP will also be advertised in our weekly newsletter, and linked in the newsletter for easy access to NES families.

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))

NES will hold regular parental engagement events to build positive home-school partnerships. Academic Parent Teacher Team meetings are held three times per year to inform parents of the instructional programs, as well as their child's progress in school.

Title I Annual Meeting is held on August 31 to inform families about the school programs and funding.

The Family Engagement Plan is available on NES website at <http://nes.okee.k12.fl.us/>.

A copy of the Family Engagement Plan is available to parents in a Parent Information binder in our office waiting area.

The availability of the Family Engagement plan will also be advertised in our weekly newsletter, and linked in the newsletter for easy access to NES families.

Weekly updates to families are shared via NES News for Families that is made available to families via e-mail, Class DOJO, and social media.

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)

Our academic program implementation is improved by strategic PLC process and professional development. Instructional programming is strengthened by a careful selection of instructional core and supplemental materials, with a goal to meet and reach the depth of the benchmarks in every subject area.

Instructional time is valued and used to the maximum extent possible.

NES provides an on site gifted programming that supports core instruction across the subject areas, and provides enrichment to students in the area of STEM.

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 applicable laws and regulations are considered when writing this plan.

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))

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))

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).

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))

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))

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$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.

Yes