

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Floresta Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>24</b> |

# Floresta Elementary School

1501 SE FLORESTA DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Traci Wilke**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 78%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (55%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)<br>2016-17: B (54%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>24</b> |

# Floresta Elementary School

1501 SE FLORESTA DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

## School Demographics

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p> | <p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">69%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">64%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2020-21</b> | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> |                | B              | B              | C              |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Our mission at Floresta Elementary is to facilitate the learning and growth of all students academically , socially, and emotionally. As a collaborative unit, educators provide educational instruction that will lead to the advancement of all students, despite disability, socio-economic hardships or low readiness for learning. We are committed to fostering an environment where students feel safe to share concerns and problem solve through areas of concern for the classroom. Using the Sanford Harmony curriculum, we are teaching appropriate social/emotional skills that will help to benefit students in school and in the community. Student have the opportunity to practice skills learned through the social emotional curriculum in real world settings.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

All students will leave Floresta with mastery of all subject area skills so they are equipped to succeed in their future endeavors. Floresta stakeholders encouraged to actively participate in our school, both formally and informally.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Luckey, Marcy    | Principal           |                                 |
| Cox, Jane        | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Rolle, Stacey    | Instructional Coach |                                 |
| McNeal, Belinda  | Teacher, ESE        |                                 |
| Dohrmann, Amy    | School Counselor    |                                 |
| Thomas, Amy      |                     |                                 |
| Gray, Julie      |                     |                                 |
| Dulemba, Karen   |                     |                                 |
| Franklin, Ashley |                     |                                 |
| Gonsler, Pamela  |                     |                                 |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/1/2021, Traci Wilke

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

657

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

7

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

7

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |    |    |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|----|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1   | 2  | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 89          | 100 | 96 | 95 | 136 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 626   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 23          | 28  | 21 | 24 | 35  | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 157   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 1   | 2  | 5  | 1   | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0  | 12 | 13  | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0  | 19 | 14  | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0  | 33 | 40  | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 99    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0  | 38 | 41  | 22  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 1   | 1  | 1  | 8   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |     |     |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|-----|-----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1  | 2  | 3   | 4   | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 25          | 29 | 24 | 132 | 152 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 452   |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**



| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/17/2021

**2020-21 - As Reported**

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |    |    |    |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 87          | 91 | 93 | 89 | 128 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 589   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 17 | 18 | 26 | 19  | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 95    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 2  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6   | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**2020-21 - Updated**

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |    |    |    |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 87          | 91 | 93 | 89 | 128 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 589   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 23          | 28 | 21 | 24 | 35  | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 157   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 2  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6   | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 57%    | 50%      | 57%   | 53%    | 50%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 63%    | 55%      | 58%   | 53%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 65%    | 54%      | 53%   | 43%    | 55%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 63%    | 53%      | 63%   | 63%    | 56%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 53%    | 50%      | 62%   | 60%    | 56%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 35%    | 42%      | 51%   | 35%    | 46%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 52%    | 46%      | 53%   | 53%    | 51%      | 55%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 56%    | 50%      | 6%                         | 58%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 51%      | -3%                        | 58%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -56%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 48%      | 16%                        | 56%   | 8%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -48%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 69%    | 55%      | 14%                        | 62%   | 7%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 66%    | 54%      | 12%                        | 64%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -69%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 47%      | 4%                         | 60%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -66%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 46%      | 6%                         | 53%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grades 1-5 iReady Diagnostic Data

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 34   | 26     | 42     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 31   | 22     | 36     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 31   | 39     | 46     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 14   | 5      | 18     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 26   | 23     | 45     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 21   | 21     | 45     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 15   | 31     | 54     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 18   | 5      | 36     |

| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 76   | 86     | 93     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 71   | 80     | 92     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 46   | 64     | 82     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 65   | 77     | 94     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 79   | 92     | 93     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 74   | 89     | 91     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 64   | 73     | 82     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 65   | 88     | 94     |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 83   | 89     | 93     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 78   | 86     | 94     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 73   | 67     | 73     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 64   | 73     | 64     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 85   | 94     | 98     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 85   | 94     | 97     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 80   | 71     | 100    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 82   | 91     | 100    |

| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 83   | 89     | 86     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 79   | 88     | 80     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 27   | 55     | 36     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 62   | 77     | 77     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 84   | 90     | 92     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 79   | 88     | 89     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 64   | 64     | 74     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 62   | 85     | 77     |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 74   | 85     | 83     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 81   | 79     | 83     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 33   | 60     | 53     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 38   | 50     | 63     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 56   | 92     | 97     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 59   | 91     | 95     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 36   | 87     | 93     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 40   | 88     | 100    |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 77   | 78     | 77     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 75   | 71     | 74     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 47   | 67     | 67     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 63   | 63     | 50     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD                                       | 20       | 41     | 45          | 27        | 35      | 42           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 25       | 68     |             | 34        | 53      |              | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 60     |             | 32        | 36      |              | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 65     |             | 44        | 46      |              | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 38       | 50     |             | 42        | 18      |              | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 55       | 45     | 45          | 58        | 36      | 30           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 43       | 59     | 58          | 42        | 33      | 33           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD                                       | 31       | 47     | 31          | 47        | 53      | 25           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       | 64     | 77          | 47        | 55      | 54           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 51     | 31          | 47        | 37      | 14           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| HSP                                       | 57       | 65     | 87          | 68        | 60      | 56           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 54       | 71     |             | 65        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 64     | 71          | 66        | 53      | 36           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 53       | 61     | 64          | 59        | 46      | 35           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 27       | 35     | 27          | 32        | 23      | 8            | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 27       | 64     | 57          | 45        | 56      | 25           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 49     | 56          | 55        | 53      | 47           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 51       | 59     | 46          | 60        | 58      | 27           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 56       | 64     |             | 56        | 64      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 59       | 50     | 20          | 70        | 66      | 35           | 66       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 49       | 49     | 38          | 60        | 60      | 36           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 44  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 33  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 354 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 96% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 31  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 42  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO  |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 41  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 50  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 36  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 45  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |



| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 43 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |    |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

1. Decreased proficiency, gains, and bottom quartile gains in ELA.
2. Decreased proficiency and gains in Math.
3. Stagnant bottom quartile gains in Math.
4. Decreased proficiency in Science

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Floresta's greatest need for improvement is gains in both ELA and Math for all students and especially the lowest 25% of students. All students are capable of making gains and our goal is to increase the number of students making gains, even if they do not reach proficiency.

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Up until the end of the 20-21 school year, over a quarter of Floresta students were still online for instruction, despite many being asked to return to school due to poor progress online. Now that we have students back on campus we have opportunity to more efficiently provide small group instruction to remediate in areas of need. Teachers will also receive professional development and strategies for how to sort data to determine the skills which need remediation.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Bottom Quartile gains in Math.

#### What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

As a school we had a greater focus on targeted small group instruction for deficits in math, in addition to the grade level instruction.

#### What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1. All students are currently on campus for face-to-face instruction.
2. Increased attentiveness to SWD and ELL students in Reading and Math
3. Tutoring opportunities for identified students with gaps in instruction.
4. Referral to Tier 2 intervention for those with severe deficits which may not have previously been identified.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

1. iReady Data and Unit Assessment Data training to assist teachers to pull data for skill deficits
2. iReady training in how to pull materials specific to student needs
3. Training in how to determine the number of points necessary for students to be considered a gain

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

1. Continued iReady Data and Unit Assessment Data training to assist teachers to pull data for skill deficits
2. Continued iReady training in how to pull materials specific to student needs
3. Training in how to determine the number of points necessary for students to be considered a gain

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Based on instructional and FSA data, teachers struggle with the provision of targeted and rigorous instruction in reading to help closing learning gaps for students.

**Measurable Outcome:** Data from the 20-21 FSA showed that student proficiency and gains in Reading have declined at least 10% in each area since the last assessment in 2018-19. In addition, the FSA is consistent with school district data of Unit Assessments and iReady Diagnostic data.

**Monitoring:**

1. Weekly Classroom Observations specific to Reading
2. Weekly monitoring and grade group data chats, using district assessment data in reading.
3. Weekly review of student work in Collaborative Planning compare student products to exemplars, allowing for improve teaching practice.
4. Use of trend data from classroom observations to provide teacher PD based upon deficits in the teaching process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** BEST Standards

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The district has chosen a curriculum which aligns with the requirements of the BEST standard and the bridge with Florida State Standards. Our goal is to follow the new curriculum with fidelity so that students will receive the greatest benefits of the new standards.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Each grade level has a Collaborative planning facilitator and a Coach to assist with the planning of lessons.
2. Reading Diagnostic data and Unit Assessment data will be used throughout the year to create small groups for remediation and enrichment.
3. Weekly review of Unit Assessment data to gauge student progress
4. Weekly reading walks to observe reading instruction.

**Person Responsible** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Based on instructional and FSA data, teachers struggle with the provision of targeted and rigorous instruction in Math to help close learning gaps for students.

**Measurable Outcome:** Data from the 20-21 FSA showed that student proficiency and gains in Math have declined at least 10% in each area since the last assessment in 2018-19. In addition, the FSA is consistent with school district data of Unit Assessments and iReady Diagnostic data.

- Monitoring:**
1. Weekly Classroom Observations specific to Math
  2. Weekly monitoring and grade group data chats, using district assessment data in Math.
  3. Weekly review of student work in Collaborative Planning compare student products to exemplars, allowing for improve teaching practice.
  4. Use of trend data from classroom observations to provide teacher PD based upon deficits in the teaching process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Small Group Instruction in Math

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Small group instruction is a method to assist student that are struggling with the content, as well as to enrich students who are more advanced.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Each grade level has a Collaborative planning facilitator and a Coach to assist with the planning of lessons.
2. Math Diagnostic data and Unit Assessment data will be used throughout the year to create small groups for remediation and enrichment.
3. Weekly review of Unit Assessment data to gauge student progress
4. Weekly Math walks to observe reading instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Schoolwide data shows that SWD achieve proficiency at a lesser than general education students

**Measurable Outcome:** The goal for Floresta is for our SWDs of achieve at least 42 percent proficiency to be above the Federal Index.

**Monitoring:**

1. Weekly Classroom Observations specific to SWD services in the general education classroom
2. Weekly monitoring and grade group data chats (including SWD Teachers), using district assessment data in reading and math.
3. Weekly review of student work in Collaborative Planning compare student products to exemplars, allowing for improve teaching practice.
4. Use of trend data from classroom observations to provide teacher PD based upon deficits in the teaching process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Differentiated Small Group Instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Differentiated Small Group instruction can help to close gaps in learning for struggling students, which in turn helps to increase the number of proficient students in the subgroup.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Data review specific to SWD students in comparison to all students
2. Classroom walkthroughs to monitor SWD instruction in the general education classroom.
3. Coaches, administration and teachers will use walk through and assessment data to determine the effectiveness of small group instruction and to provide support to teachers, as needed.

**Person Responsible** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

#### #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** One of the keys to student success is being a part of the school community. Due to the separation of many of Floresta's students during COVID we want to make sure to reconnect all students to the Floresta family.

**Measurable Outcome:** Based on Student Climate data we are expecting to see that students respond positively in the areas of their feelings of connection to the school.

**Monitoring:**

1. Community Circle Walks by administration
2. SEL Walks by administration for SEL Instruction
3. Review and Action planning based on Student School Climate Data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Harmony Weekly. Daily Circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of SEL skills.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our students are lacking many of the basic life skills needed for success in school, at home and in the community. Intentional focus on cultivating SEL competencies is a proven strategy used to reduce discipline concerns, increase attendance and develop positive learning communities.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Community Circle Walks by administration
2. SEL Walks by administration for SEL Instruction
3. Review and Action planning based on Student School Climate Data

**Person Responsible:** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

## #5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

**Area of Focus** One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA.  
**Description and Rationale:** 3rd Grade- 41%  
 4th Grade- 40%

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of 2022, 51% students in grade 3 and 4 will show proficiency in ELA.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, K-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan)
- Use Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention.
- Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum.
- Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress.

### Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group – using monitoring schools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments).

**Person Responsible** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention

**Person Responsible** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback

**Person Responsible** Marcy Luckey (marcy.luckey@stlucieschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**No concerns with discipline data at this time, however, we closely scrutinize every referral to make sure that we provide consequences for action that include no time out of school when at all possible.**

### Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

#### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Students with strong social-emotional skills are better able to cope with everyday challenges and benefit academically and socially. Social and emotional competency lead to positive and long-term impact on student outcomes both in and of school. The five SEL competencies of self awareness, social awareness, relationship skills, responsible decision making and self management are vital for school, work, and life success. Floresta has a plan in place to work through the Sanford Harmony program to increase student Social and Emotional skills. In addition, time is set aside in the student schedule for Community Circles, which help to build classroom culture and helping students to have a sense of belonging.

#### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Floresta has a number of stakeholders that help to promote a positive learning culture and environment. Teachers and staff, students, parents, School Advisory Council members, and volunteers work together to ensure that Floresta is meeting the social and emotional needs of our students. We sponsor activities during the year so that stakeholders are able to join us on campus for official school business, as well as for fun social events including everyone. With all stakeholders working together as a Floresta community we are able to help meet the social and emotional needs of our students.

### Part V: Budget

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

|   |        |   |        |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|---|--------|



|               |        |  |               |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                     | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities        | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00        |
| 5             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                      | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |