



St. Lucie Public Schools

NORTHPORT K-8 SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 6
 - D. Early Warning Systems 7
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 15
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 18
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 19
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 27
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 30
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 34
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 35

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

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

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Glenn H. Rustay

glenn.rustay@stlucieschools.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Leadership and Vision

Administrative Management

Staff Supervision and Development

Curriculum and Instruction

Student Support and Discipline
School Improvement and Accountability

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Lisa Cash

lisa.cash@stlucieschools.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Principal in all aspects of School Operations

Prepare and submit SIP

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Brittany Rampone

brittany.rampone@stlucieschools.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the principal with all aspects of School Operations

Oversee student discipline

Oversee SWD Programs

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Lorena Wilson

lorena.wilson@stlucieschools.org

Position Title

Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provide support to instructional staff in grades K-3 for Literacy

Support the core curriculum and District-approved programs

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Laurie Farr

laurie.farr@stlucieschools.org

Position Title

Math Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support Instructional staff in grades K-5 in Math

Provide support for the core curriculum and District-approved materials

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Diana Lankow

diana.lankow@stlucieschools.org

Position Title

Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support instructional staff in grades 4-8 in ELA

Provide support with core curriculum and District-approved materials

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Scott Nicks

scott.nicks@stlucieschools.org

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provide support to instructional staff in grades 6-8 in Math and Science

Support core curriculum and District-approved materials

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Elizabeth Butterworth

elizabeth.butterworth@stlucieschools.org

Position Title

School Assessment Coordinator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Manage Assessment for all students K-8

Provide data analysis and professional learning

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2)).

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) actively engages in the School Improvement Process. Meetings are scheduled for each month. School Messenger invitations are sent before each meeting inviting parents and community members to attend, either in person or virtually. Each subgroup of stakeholders is represented, and peers vote on new members. Participants are invited to discuss and provide feedback on items concerning school-based programs and policies.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

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

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	COMBINATION KG-8
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	76.9%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	CSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)* ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: B 2023-24: C 2022-23: C 2021-22: C 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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	
School Enrollment	77	88	89	105	103	106	153	194	218	1,133
Absent 10% or more school days	3	26	18	19	18	27	40	42	53	246
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	6	8	3	18	56	65	163
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	11	13	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	19	14	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	18	29	35	12	21	49	35	46	245
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		25	18	35	15	27	52	34	61	267
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	8	12	10						30
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	12	13	18	3					46

Current Year 2025-26

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	22	25	30	14	16	49	43	63	262

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year			2	12					3	17
Students retained two or more times									1	1

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days	6	26	23	27	13	34	39	41	61	270
One or more suspensions			3	14	4	15	24	45	69	174
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		15	10	10	3	31	10	7	38	124
Course failure in Math		12	12	10	2	16	8	29	26	115
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		15	10	10	3	31	10	27	38	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		25	18	35	15	27	52	34	61	267
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	19	14	26	6						65
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	12	10	19	5	11					57

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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		27	19	33	12	43	31	56	74	295

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year		1	1	7					3	12
Students retained two or more times								1	2	3

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	52	59	61	45	52	58	39	50	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	55	57	62	52	52	59	34	51	56
ELA Learning Gains	59	61	61	55	56	59			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59	60	55	46	54	54			
Math Achievement*	54	61	62	48	55	59	42	51	55
Math Learning Gains	58	62	60	58	59	61			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62	58	53	65	60	56			
Science Achievement	43	59	57	41	56	54	38	52	52
Social Studies Achievement*	65	77	74	61	72	72	62	71	68
Graduation Rate		95	72		91	71		90	74
Middle School Acceleration	63	82	75	70	77	71	69	75	70
College and Career Acceleration		67	56		68	54		69	53
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	62	56	61	48	49	59	31	44	55

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	57%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	632
Total Components for the FPPI	11
Percent Tested	98%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
57%	54%	45%	50%	44%		58%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 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%
Students With Disabilities	40%	Yes	6	
English Language Learners	53%	No		
Asian Students	50%	No		
Black/African American Students	56%	No		
Hispanic Students	57%	No		
Multiracial Students	64%	No		
White Students	60%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	57%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	52%	55%	59%	59%	54%	58%	62%	43%	65%	63%			62%
Students With Disabilities	22%	21%	49%	59%	32%	53%	54%	23%	41%				41%
English Language Learners	36%	69%	55%	60%	44%	62%	63%	32%	43%				62%
Asian Students					50%								
Black/African American Students	48%	48%	57%	60%	52%	59%	59%	38%	61%	76%			54%
Hispanic Students	49%	58%	56%	56%	53%	58%	60%	42%	61%	64%			66%
Multiracial Students	60%		69%	58%	60%	60%	75%	59%	67%	70%			
White Students	59%	56%	63%	63%	58%	58%	64%	45%	74%	56%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	53%	58%	61%	52%	57%	60%	42%	65%	61%			64%
28/2025													

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	45%	52%	55%	46%	48%	58%	65%	41%	61%	70%			48%
Students With Disabilities	15%	23%	44%	45%	23%	57%	62%	15%	27%				21%
English Language Learners	25%	28%	47%	50%	33%	59%	72%	34%	36%	60%			48%
Black/African American Students	42%	47%	55%	46%	43%	58%	60%	40%	59%	63%			41%
Hispanic Students	41%	52%	52%	47%	45%	50%	61%	40%	56%	71%			51%
Multiracial Students	56%		69%	62%	54%	74%	71%	40%	69%				
White Students	52%	65%	56%	38%	58%	65%	83%	44%	70%	70%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	43%	49%	54%	46%	46%	57%	65%	36%	61%	65%			44%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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%	34%			42%			38%	62%	69%			31%
Students With Disabilities	15%	29%			23%			12%	29%				15%
English Language Learners	26%	23%			30%			17%	54%				33%
Asian Students	17%				28%								
Black/African American Students	34%	27%			38%			33%	57%	77%			30%
Hispanic Students	39%	24%			40%			39%	60%	74%			35%
Multiracial Students	49%				39%			41%	50%				
White Students	46%	55%			52%			45%	74%	61%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	35%	31%			37%			33%	58%	65%			31%

E. 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.

There is no assessment data available for this school.

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

While our overall data showed increases in all but one component, Learning Gains for ELA Lowest 25%ile showed the greatest improvement. Scores indicated a jump from 47 to 59 for an increase in 12%. Increased emphasis on data planning and CLPs provided focus to this area.

Lowest Performance

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

The area of lowest performance was 43% proficiency in Science, up from 41% the previous year. Several factors contribute to low performance in science education. Student motivation plays a significant role in influencing science learning outcomes. Effective CLPs in science and scheduling issues contributed to this decline.

Greatest Decline

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

Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%ile was the only decrease from the prior year, down from 62% to 60%.

Greatest Gap

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.

Looking at average scale scores, the greatest gap was in 7th grade Math. We averaged 223 compared to a state average of 234. This is attributed to the fact that the majority of our 7th grade students participate in accelerated math courses.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Student Attendance

Highest Priorities

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

Student Attendance

ELA Proficiency

Math Proficiency

ELA RAISE Graes 2, 5

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Students at all grade levels identified as part of the subgroup "Students With Disabilities" continue to score below their peers, scoring 33% on the Federal Index in the 2023-2024 school year. While considerable growth was achieved with an increase from 33% to 40%, work must continue to reach 41%.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the Federal Index for "Students With Disabilities" will increase by 5% to 45%, exceeding the threshold of 41%, as measured by FAST assessments.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Brittany Rampone, Jessica LaMantia

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:****Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Master Schedule

Person Monitoring:

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

By When/Frequency:

May 2026; quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

TSA for ESE and School-based ESE Specialists will monitor instruction and ensure procedural safeguards. SWD will be placed appropriately in LRE for core subjects. Progress monitoring will provide data for IEP review consideration.

Action Step #2

Really Great Reading

Person Monitoring:

Brittant Rampone

By When/Frequency:

May 2026, quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Support Facilitators and Resource teachers will be trained to use Really Good Reading for students in need of additional direct instruction in phonics.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

There will be a focus on the implementation of quality Tier 1 Instruction. Proficiency increased from 45% to 52% as measured by FAST. The rationale for this focus is the continuing need for progress.

Learning gains were 59% and BQ Gains were 59%. While these demonstrate gains in all three areas, a need still exists for higher proficiency. Performance in ELA remains an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

During the 2025-26 school year, general education teachers, as well as teachers of students with disabilities, will participate in focused collaborative learning and planning (CLP) meetings with their respective grades/teams. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons using BEST standards and best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will result in 56% of ELA students in grades 3-8 demonstrating proficiency as measured by FAST testing.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Assigned administrators will participate in CLPs weekly. Walk-throughs will be monitored for pacing and adherence to SLPS Scope and Sequence. Fidelity Checks will be conducted with results analyzed and action plans developed if necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Glenn Rustay, Lisa Cash, Brittany Rampone

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Benchmark Advance K-5 Leveled Literacy Intervention Tier 2 and Tier 3, K-5 (Comprehension) (STRONG) Savvas My Perspective 6-8 IXL 6-8 Top Score Writing 3-5 UFLI Phonics K-2 Heggerty K Phonemic Awareness

Rationale:

Research has indicated that explicit instruction in text-based writing and reading comprehension will increase proficiency, resulting in increased learning gains. In addition, research indicates a strong correlation between phonics and foundational skills and future success in reading.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

UFLI K-2 Phonics

Person Monitoring:

Lorena Wilson

By When/Frequency:

May 2026; weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

UFLI Phonics will be implemented in all K-2 settings. This explicit phonics instruction showed strong indicators of success in Tier 3 and has been adopted as Tier 1 Phonics for K-2.

Action Step #2

Standards-based Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Lorena Wilson, Lisa Cash

By When/Frequency:

May 2026; weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor the use of approved curriculum addressing BEST standards through walk-throughs and CLPs.

Action Step #3

District Support

Person Monitoring:

Lisa Cash

By When/Frequency:

May 2026; as needed

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Utilize District Supports available through the Office of Teaching and Learning.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

The area of focus will be implementing quality Tier 1 instruction in Math using district-approved curriculum with fidelity. The rationale for this is that we continue to lag behind the state in proficiency.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

During the 2024-2025 school year, general education teachers, as well as teachers of students with

disabilities, will participate in focused collaborative learning and planning (CLP) meetings with their respective grades/teams. Teachers will develop, plan, and implement lessons using BEST standards and best practices for inclusion. Targeted planning and instruction will result in 57% of students achieving proficiency in Math.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Assigned administrators will participate in CLPs every week. Instruction will be monitored for pacing and adherence to the SLPS Scope and Sequence.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Glenn Rustay, Laurie Farr, Scott Nicks

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Quality instruction has the most significant impact on student achievement. Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction in small groups to increase achievement in Math. Savvas Math is used in K-8 iReady

Rationale:

Differentiated instruction is a high-effect size strategy that allows teachers to work with small groups of students to instruct them at their level of learning and targeted skills. Savvas Math 6-8 iReady K-5 IXL 6-8

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Planning for Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Laurie Farr, Scott Nicks

By When/Frequency:

May 2026, weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Effective planning for math instruction is crucial for enhancing student achievement. Research

indicates that when teachers are well-prepared and use a variety of instructional strategies, students' understanding and performance in mathematics improve significantly.

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

This area of focus is the ability to deliver effective, evidence-based reading instruction aligned with grade-level standards. Indicators of proficiency include the implementation of structured literacy practices, differentiation, targeted interventions, comprehension strategies, and progress monitoring.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

During the 2024-2025 school year, 48% of second graders were proficient as measured by FAST ELA. An area of focus is standards-based instruction. A review of the data indicates the need for a laser focus on identifying critical elements of the BEST standards, as well as increased use of the gradual release model and small group instruction.

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

During the 2024-2025 school year, 40% of fifth graders were proficient as measured by FAST ELA. An area of focus is standards-based instruction. A review of the data indicates the need for a laser focus on identifying critical elements of the BEST standards, as well as increased use of the gradual release model and small group instruction.

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, students in second grade will demonstrate proficiency by scoring at or above 51% as measured by FAST ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, students in fifth grade will demonstrate proficiency by scoring at or above 51% as measured by FAST ELA.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach

the desired outcome.

Ongoing monitoring of student progress is a critical component of the educational process. Regular assessments allow for the identification of individual student needs, enabling tailored instructional approaches that support student growth and achievement. Furthermore, this continuous feedback encourages students to be responsible for their learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Lisa Cash, Lorena Wilson, Diana Lankow

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

UFLI

Rationale:

Using UFLI for intervention for Tier 2/3 students in grades 4 and 5 will address deficits in foundational skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

RtI Walk to Intervention

Person Monitoring:

Lisa Cash

By When/Frequency:

May 2026; monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Progress monitoring will occur quarterly, with groups changed as needed. Levels of LLI will be adjusted as well. Intervention occurs during the MTSS block. Tier 3 students are served by the Reading Interventionist in small groups outside the uninterrupted Literacy block.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

An Area of focus for the 2025-26 school year is student attendance. This was identified through analysis of the data.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2025-26 school year, Average Daily Attendance for all students in grades PK through eighth will be 94%, as measured by SkyWard and PowerBI.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Attendance Committee

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:

Evidence suggests that attendance improves when interventions are implemented.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Attendance Monitoring

Person Monitoring:
Attendance Committee

By When/Frequency:
June 2026; monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Reports from SkyWard and Power BI will be analyzed. District protocols will be followed with targeted students. Counselors and social workers will be asked to intervene when needed.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

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

The School Improvement Plan is available on the school's website. Access instructions are published in the monthly newsletter, which is available digitally via email and the website.

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/npk/staff/>

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

Monthly activities are planned to educate the community, including parents, families, and other stakeholders, about the programs and curriculum that fulfill the mission of Northport K8. As outlined in the PFEP, informational segments are intertwined with enjoyable family events such as Trivia Tuesday, Bingo for Books, Let's Taco About Attendance and Bingo for Books.

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/npk/staff/>

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

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

How Plan is Developed

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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

NA

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

Addressing the complex needs of mental health requires a multifaceted approach. Counseling and mental health services are crucial in supporting students as they work to meet and exceed state standards. Collaborative efforts between professionals and community organizations can enhance the availability and quality of these essential services.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

Students have the opportunity to participate in Culinary Arts, Art, and Band, preparing them for further study in high school. Our proficient students participate in AMP (Accelerated Math Program), which provides the opportunity to receive high school credits in Algebra and Geometry with successful scores on the respective EOCs. Gifted/ enriched students may also receive a high school credit for Spanish I. Students in PLTW (Project Lead The Way) complete industry certifications which prepare them for the workforce.

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

The Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a proactive, multi-tiered framework adopted by schools to support and improve all students' behavioral and academic outcomes. It emphasizes the prevention of problem behavior through evidence-based interventions and data-driven decision-making. PBIS is not a scripted program but a flexible approach that can be adapted to meet the diverse needs of individual schools and their students

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

Professional learning aimed at improving instruction and the use of data is conducted monthly in grade groups and departments. This involves teaching the strategic approach of educators utilizing student data to inform and enhance their teaching methods.

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

NA

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

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

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

Specific Resources include the curriculum to meet the specialized needs of our SWD. This includes but is not limited to Really Great Reading, Unique, and ancillary resources from Benchmark Advance and LLI. The timeline begins at the beginning of the year as we determine needs and work with SAC, PTO, and District staff.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00