

St. Lucie Public Schools

Savanna Ridge Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 29 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Savanna Ridge Elementary School

6801 SE LENNARD RD, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

Demographics

Principal: Roberto Bonsenor

Start Date for this Principal: 10/13/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 79% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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.

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Savanna Ridge Elementary School

6801 SE LENNARD RD, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 75% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 68% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | C | C | B |

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.

All students will learn at Savanna Ridge Elementary. Through a nurturing environment, which supports quality and equitable achievement, we will create a strong educational foundation on which future experiences can be built.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Savanna Ridge Elementary will provide a world class education to all students through the use of quality instruction, technology and real life experiences. We will instill leadership principles in an effort to have our students thrive in the 21st century.

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Bonsenor, Roberto | Principal | <p>The team will meet on a monthly basis as a minimum. The School Leadership Team will be focusing on several major initiatives that include Data Analysis, Standards Based Instruction, Collaborative Learning and Planning, implementation of Thinking Maps, Response to Literature, Discipline Data, iReady data, instructional staff support and needs, and providing professional growth opportunities to teachers and staff. Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based & shared decision-making and ensures that the school-based team is implementing district and school initiatives Assistant Principal: Supports the vision of the school and follows the direction of the principal to ensure the leadership team and school are collaborating and following through with the established plan. Instructional Coaches & Interventionist: Facilitates the data/curriculum meetings in reference to content support with emphasis on reading, math, and researched based instructional strategies. Provides data to monitor instruction and develops action plans to assist identified students. ESE Chair: Will analyze ESE data to determine necessary instructional strategies and support. She will also facilitate collaboration among ESE staff with mainstream teachers. Executive Secretary: Take meeting minutes, make calendar updates, and track inventory/ orders. School Counselor: Provides guidance and support to both students and staff. She serves as the testing coordinator ensuring proper administration of district and statewide assessments taking into account students accommodations.</p> |
| Xanthopoulos, Eileen | Assistant Principal | <p>Assists in the development and monitoring of the instructional programs. Assists in the observation and/or evaluation of assigned instructional and non-instructional school personnel. Assists in the daily supervision of the school facilities for both academic and non-academic purposes to ensure the safety of students and faculty. Informs the Principal of events and activities of an unusual nature as well as routine matters related to the Principal's accountability. Responds to written and oral requests for information. Serves as a member of committees and attends meetings as the Principal shall direct. Purchases, receives, distributes and maintains inventory for supplies (textbooks, etc.) equipment, and furniture as needed for instructional and non-instructional personnel. Maintains relationships with staff, students and parents to create a positive school climate. Prepares and maintains required records and reports for data analysis. Assists in establishing guides for proper student conduct and maintaining student discipline. Discusses and resolves individual student problems. Establishes and maintains favorable relationships with local community groups and individuals to foster understanding and solicit support for overall school objectives and programs. Assists in establishing and maintaining an effective learning climate in the school. Follow district policies and procedures related to human resources, finances, curriculum initiatives. Performs other duties as designated by the Principal.</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Lamora, Samantha | Instructional Coach | <p>To be a learner and practitioner of pertinent research in the area of assignment.</p> <p>To assist students with deficiencies within the RtI (Response to Intervention) model.</p> <p>To coach teachers in the fidelity of implementation of district standards initiative.</p> <p>To model for teachers proven techniques of teaching, based on the framework for quality instruction.</p> <p>To facilitate collaboration among faculty members of information regarding successful strategies.</p> <p>To facilitate relevant profession development to improve teachers' professional practices.</p> <p>To assist teachers in testing, analyzing, and using diagnostics and progress monitoring test data to identify "root cause" for poor performance, to improve students' performance, and to suggest strategies for remediation or acceleration.</p> <p>To review outcome measures of standardized assessments to identify students needing special intervention.</p> <p>To help teachers plan and identify effective resources for instruction.</p> <p>To meet on a regular basis with the other site-based coaches in a network to receive professional development and to share effective instructional practices.</p> <p>To work with identified students in order to recognize factors contributing to diminished progress.</p> <p>To demonstrate interpersonal skills as member of an academic coaching team and build trust with teachers and school leadership.</p> <p>To perform assigned tasks in a timely and efficient manner.</p> <p>To perform assigned tasks with a high standard of quality.</p> <p>To perform other duties as directed by the principal.</p> |
| Motto, Rene | Instructional Coach | <p>To be a learner and practitioner of pertinent research in the area of assignment.</p> <p>To assist students with deficiencies within the RtI (Response to Intervention) model.</p> <p>To coach teachers in the fidelity of implementation of district standards initiative.</p> <p>To model for teachers proven techniques of teaching, based on the framework for quality instruction.</p> <p>To facilitate collaboration among faculty members of information regarding successful strategies.</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|------------------|--|
| | | <p>To facilitate relevant profession development to improve teachers' professional practices.</p> <p>To assist teachers in testing, analyzing, and using diagnostics and progress monitoring test data to identify "root cause" for poor performance, to improve students' performance, and to suggest strategies for remediation or acceleration.</p> <p>To review outcome measures of standardized assessments to identify students needing special intervention.</p> <p>To help teachers plan and identify effective resources for instruction.</p> <p>To meet on a regular basis with the other site-based coaches in a network to receive professional development and to share effective instructional practices.</p> <p>To work with identified students in order to recognize factors contributing to diminished progress.</p> <p>To demonstrate interpersonal skills as member of an academic coaching team and build trust with teachers and school leadership.</p> <p>To perform assigned tasks in a timely and efficient manner.</p> <p>To perform assigned tasks with a high standard of quality.</p> <p>To perform other duties as directed by the principal.</p> |
| Vermillion, Jaimie | School Counselor | <p>Serve as a liaison for special services that students may require.</p> <p>Providing counseling to meet individual, small and whole group needs.</p> <p>Promoting positive school environment by fostering family and community partnerships to support the social/emotional and academic development of all students.</p> <p>Assisting parents and faculty to understand individual student growth and development through education and resources.</p> <p>Coordination with ESE personnel to determine referrals for services; academic and behavioral needs based on sufficient data to support student success.</p> <p>I administer standardized tests to individuals and groups of students and interpret the test data to students, parents, teachers and administrators.</p> <p>Creating schedules, completing state paperwork with the utmost fidelity to ensure accurate recording and reporting.</p> <p>Creating and delivering data driven programs to students for prevention and coping skills.</p> <p>Analyzes and reports outcomes of the school counseling program and goals, to determine changes or effectiveness of school counseling programs, including social emotional skills, coping skills and preventative care.</p> |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 10/13/2017, Roberto Bonsenor

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

455

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 21 | 15 | 17 | 24 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 29 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 36 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 29 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

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 | | | | 51% | 50% | 57% | 57% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 55% | 58% | 66% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54% | 54% | 53% | 59% | 55% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 49% | 53% | 63% | 60% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 35% | 50% | 62% | 65% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 21% | 42% | 51% | 46% | 46% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 58% | 46% | 53% | 54% | 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 | 36% | 50% | -14% | 58% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 51% | 0% | 58% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 48% | 6% | 56% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 55% | -4% | 62% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 54% | 3% | 64% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 47% | -11% | 60% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 46% | 8% | 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.

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for was iReady Diagnostics. Science progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 23 | 14 | 22 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21 | 16 | 27 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 14 | 13 | 13 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 19 | 13 | 19 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19 | 14 | 20 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| | | | | |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15 | 8 | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 0 | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12 | 10 | 22 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 10 | 18 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 58 | 67 | 14 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 40 | 73 | 78 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40 | 74 | 79 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11 | 55 | 64 |
| | English Language Learners | 30 | 58 | 67 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 57 | 74 | 18 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 57 | 72 | 19 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 46 | 46 | 9 |
| | English Language Learners | 58 | 67 | 14 |
| | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 54 | 67 | 65 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 54 | 67 | 65 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 25 | 29 |
| | English Language Learners | 57 | 43 | 57 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 50 | 67 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48 | 64 | 66 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6 | 31 | 28 |
| | English Language Learners | 57 | 50 | 65 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 44 | 47 | 54 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36 | 44 | 54 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 57 | 63 | 73 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 53 | 63 | 72 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 40 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 10 | 40 | 30 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 54 | 59 | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49 | 55 | 58 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 10 | 10 |

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 | 6 | | | 15 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 50 | | 33 | 27 | | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 57 | | 18 | 25 | | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 50 | | 45 | 47 | | 33 | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 59 | | 54 | 45 | | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 53 | 57 | 34 | 31 | 42 | 47 | | | | |
| 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 | 23 | 43 | 50 | 27 | 30 | 26 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 47 | | 41 | 35 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 45 | 38 | 40 | 27 | 13 | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 57 | 50 | 46 | 38 | 27 | 48 | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 63 | 70 | 71 | 60 | 41 | 25 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 58 | 50 | 45 | 38 | 18 | 55 | | | | |
| 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 | 28 | 50 | 54 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 70 | 67 | 46 | 74 | | 9 | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 57 | 50 | 52 | 61 | 64 | 40 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 71 | 54 | 58 | 60 | 33 | 46 | | | | |
| MUL | 53 | | | 47 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 65 | 67 | 69 | 76 | 50 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 56 | 62 | 52 | 60 | 65 | 47 | 59 | | | | |

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 | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 385 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 11 |
| 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 | 39 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 33 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 46 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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?

- Decrease in Proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science
- Increase in Learning Gain Proficiency in: ESE and Math
- Increase in Learning Gains of the Low 25% in: ELA and Math

ELA

3rd Grade: + 18% Point increase from 2019 to 2021

4th Grade: - 17% Point decrease from 2019 to 2021

5th Grade: - 8% Point decrease from 2019 to 2021

Math

3rd Grade: + 19% Point increase from 2019 to 2021

4th Grade: - 24% Point decrease from 2019 to 2021

5th Grade: + 5% Point increase from 2019 to 2021

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

The greatest need for improvement are both in ELA and Math 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?

The main contributing fact was the 5 month lost of instruction due to the pandemic.
In addition, the low number of face-to-face instruction and a high number of virtual instruction.

The new actions are as follows:

- Begin MTSS sooner in the school year
- Increasing the frequency of grade level MTSS meetings to analyze student progress and targeting needs

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

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement by +5% Points

Learning Gains of Low 25% Showed the most improvement as follows:

ELA: +9% Points

Math: +23% Points

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

Target the lower quartile students by providing strategic instruction in student's individual needs.

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

Address deficiency needs earlier in the year using research-based curriculum (Reading Horizon, Benchmark Advance, LLI, iReady)

Instructional Coaches will increase teacher support focusing on curriculum and instruction. The addition of an Interventionist to increase student achievement.

Students With Disabilities showed below 41% of Federal Index.

SWD Strategy: An intense focus on planning and executing lessons for small group instruction provided by the classroom teachers and a teacher interventionist using grade level standards and additional resources to increase fluency. In addition, a certified ESE teacher will be supporting students in an effort to meet their Individual Education (IEP). Visualizing and Verbalizing are the evidenced based curriculum that is used by our VE teachers. Creating a lot of visuals, manipulatives, repetition and Flexible Scheduling for SWD has been a top priority. A school-wide approach for planning and implementing Universal Design for Learning across all instructional and non-instructional school contexts will be adopted. Data review (charts) of all ESE students at the same rate as gen-ed students to make informed decisions for student placement on the continuum of services and support using Reading Horizon and LLI.

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.

- Monthly NEST meeting to support new teachers
- Provide refresher and new training for Reading Horizon, LLI, and Florida BEST Standards
- Provide additional CLP time for teachers to improve classroom instruction

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

- Continue to use strategies that worked in supporting students needs that were proven to produce positive result
- The additional of LLI will also support students in the area of phonics

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | High support for instructional staff focusing on B.E.S.T. Standards. In order to ensure fidelity and quality instruction across grade levels, providing ongoing support and PD on these standards is critical to the success of our students and staff. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | Through quality implementation of the B.E.S.T standards, we expect to see an increase in student achievement as measured by FSA scores, iReady data, and Unit Assessments. |
| Monitoring: | Monitoring of this area of focus will be through CLP, and data chats. In addition, classroom walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction and to provide feedback for pedagogical improvement and growth will be implemented. Coaching cycles and support will be provided on an ongoing basis. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Rene Motto (rene.motto@stlucieschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Implementation of the Benchmark Advance curriculum includes research based strategies for delivering quality instruction targeting the B.E.S.T. standards. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | B.E.S.T. standards, especially being new to all, are critical to the success of our students and staff. Providing targeted support in this area is vital to ensure that instruction meets the intent, depth, and rigor of the standards that we follow. |

Action Steps to Implement

- PD for all teachers
- Coaching cycles for applicable staff members
- Data analysis for specific student needs
- Fidelity walks
- Collaborative data review

Person Responsible Rene Motto (rene.motto@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | In grades K-3, foundational skills were identified as an area of focus based on data collected from iReady. These grades are supported in addressing the needs of their students by implementing Reading Horizons in a Tier 1 and supplemental Tier 2 capacity. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | In using the Reading Horizons program, we anticipate to see improvement in the iReady scores, specifically in the foundational area of phonics, in the cohorts served. We are following their trend data and expect to see a positive correlation between their participation in the program and their scores. |
| Monitoring: | We will measure growth from the Fall iReady to the Winter and Spring iReady diagnostics, comparing the data and correlate the changes to their overall performance in phonics areas. Additionally, we will be utilizing the Skills Checks in the Reading Horizons program to closely monitor in between the diagnostics to ensure positive growth throughout the program. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Samantha Lamora (samantha.lamora@stlucieschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Reading Horizons is a comprehensive program that identifies the phonics gap in students. When implemented with fidelity, it is proven to rewire the brain and allow for connections in foundational skills to be made and transferred to practical application. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Reading Horizons is a comprehensive program that identifies the phonics gap in students. When implemented with fidelity, it is proven to rewire the brain and allow for connections in foundational skills to be made and transferred to practical application. |

Action Steps to Implement

- PD for new teachers/ refresher PD for returning staff implementing the program
- Coaching cycles for applicable staff members
- Data analysis for specific student needs
- Tier 2 and Tier 3 utilization for targeted groups
- Fidelity walks
- Collaborative data review to ensure students make adequate progress

Person Responsible Samantha Lamora (samantha.lamora@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on previous data sources including iReady, FSA data, and Unit Assessment, we are placing a strong emphasis on providing support to the 5th grade cohort based on their trend data. |
|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Measurable Outcome: | As a result of this focus, we expect to see the current 5th graders improve in their ELA FSA, iReady, and Unit Assessment data. |
|----------------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Monitoring: | We will monitor this area of focus through data analysis as well as teacher and interventionist feedback. |
|--------------------|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Roberto Bonsenor (roberto.bonsenor@stlucieschools.org) |
|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Evidence-based Strategy: | We will be providing interventionist support for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, targeted small group instruction for Tiers 1-3, coaching support and cycles to identified staff, and instructional para support. |
|---------------------------------|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | After reviewing the trend data for this cohort, it was determined that the students would benefit from the aforementioned supports. |
|---|---|

Action Steps to Implement

- Targeted PD for teachers
- Coaching cycles for applicable staff members
- Data analysis for specific student needs
- Tier 2 and Tier 3 utilization for targeted groups
- Fidelity walks
- Collaborative data review to ensure students make adequate progress

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Person Responsible | Roberto Bonsenor (roberto.bonsenor@stlucieschools.org) |
|---------------------------|--|

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data analysis indicates a need for differentiation for our identified gifted and high achieving/high performing population. As such, we have developed the SOAR program.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of the SOAR program, we expect to see an increase in engagement levels and overall performance of our identified gifted and high achieving/high performing population.

Monitoring: We will monitor for this outcome through data analysis, and student, teacher, and parent feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Lamora (samantha.lamora@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The SOAR program will provide identified students with a pull-out resource for enrichment instruction regularly in both ELA and Math. The facilitators of the program actively pursuing gifted endorsement in order to ensure quality instruction at a rigorous level that aligns with the social and academic needs of the gifted and high achieving/high performing student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Trend data from a variety of sources including iReady, FSA, and Unit Assessments indicates a need for programming at this advanced level in order to ensure continued academic and social growth for the identified population.

Action Steps to Implement

- Data analysis to identify gifted and high achieving/high performing population
- Create a SOAR schedule
- SOAR planning/ curriculum mapping
- Student/Teacher/Parent surveys for feedback
- Periodic program reviews
- Recurring data analysis to ensure the program's success

Person Responsible Samantha Lamora (samantha.lamora@stlucieschools.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The ESSA Data shows a Federal Index of 31 for Students With Disabilities (SWD) in 2021. This is a 10% decrease which is below the average of 41%. The data further indicates the number of consecutive years Students With Disabilities Subgroup is below 41% is one year. Standards-based Instruction/Differentiated instruction/Collaborative Planning Analysis of student achievement subgroup data indicates students with disabilities are not achieving at the same rate as their non-disabled peers in reading and math. Least Restrictive Environment for Students with Disabilities An analysis of data is not reflecting an increase of Students with Disabilities participating in the Least Restrictive Environment LRE) |
| Measurable Outcome: | The intended outcome is to have Students With Disability make learning gains to reflect an overall score of 41% in 2022. This will reflect a growth of 10% from the 2019 data in this reporting category. The number of students participating in the LRE will increase by 1%-3% |
| Monitoring: | This will be monitored through iReady Diagnostics, Unit Assessments and CFUs |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tiffany Losius (tiffany.losius@stlucieschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | An intense focus on planning and executing lessons for small group instruction provided by the classroom teachers and a teacher interventionist using grade level standards and additional resources to increase fluency. In addition, a certified ESE teacher will be supporting students in an effort to meet their Individual Education (IEP). Reading Horizon Visualizing and Verbalizing are the evidenced based curriculum that is used by our VE teachers. Creating a lot of visuals, manipulatives, repetition and Flexible Scheduling for SWD has been a top priority. A school-wide approach for planning and implementing Universal Design for Learning across all instructional and non-instructional school contexts will be adopted. Data review (charts) of all ESE students at the same rate as general education students to make informed decisions for student placement on the continuum of services. Increase of certified teacher supporting students in a small group setting will support in closing the achievement gap. VE teachers and ESE Paraprofessionals are providing more intentional IEP driven services for SWD. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | These strategies are proven by research to be effective in helping students show growth and success. To provide a blueprint for creating instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individuals. Educational Research indicates that placement for Students with Disabilities in the LRE tend to have increased academic skills, increased social-emotional skills and a higher percentage of students graduating from high school. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Small Group Instruction: Teachers will provide specific grade-level standards-based differentiated small group instruction with a focus on areas of need as it relates to mastering the standards.
2. MTSS: Students will be provided Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention support on identified skills deficit area and monitored regularly.
3. Interventionist Support: An additional certified teacher, a Full-time and part-time Interventionist will push in to support targeted teacher in each grade level based on the math block's schedule.
4. Inclusion Practices by having ESE Teachers pushing-in to classrooms to support students

with and IEP to support in meeting their goals.

5. Teachers will be trained in Reading Horizons or given refreshers and also trained in LLI, and UDL planning through FDLRS

6. All Teachers will participate in Professional Development with FIN.

Person Responsible Tiffany Losius (tiffany.losius@stlucieschools.org)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus The Math Proficiency for 2021 is at 39% which shows 10% decrease from 2019.
Description and Rationale: Math Learning Gains for 2021 is at 40% which shows 5% increase from 2019. This is below the 41% Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome: The intended outcome is to have students at or above 41% at achievement level and n Lower Quartiles This will reflect a growth of 3% and 1% from the 2019 data in these reporting category.

Monitoring: These areas will be monitored via Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostics, and CFS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eileen Xanthopoulos (eileen.xanthopoulos@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: An intense focus on planning and executing lessons for small group instruction provided by the classroom teachers and a teacher interventionist using grade level standards and using additional resources to increase fluency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increase of certified teacher supporting students in a small group setting will support in closing the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Small Group Instruction: Teachers will provide specific grade-level-standards-based differentiated small group instruction with a focus on areas of need as it relates to mastering the standards.
2. MTSS: Students will be provided Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention support on identified skills deficit area and monitored regularly.
3. Interventionist Support: An additional full-time and part-time certified teacher (Interventionist) to push-in for targeted groups in each grade level based on the math block's schedule.

Person Responsible Eileen Xanthopoulos (eileen.xanthopoulos@stlucieschools.org)

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus**

One or more grades (4th and 5th) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA:

Description and

4th Grade is at 34% Proficient

5th Grade is at 46% Proficient

Rationale:**Measurable Outcome:**

By the end of 2022, 51% students in grades 4th and 5th 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:

Rene Motto (rene.motto@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

Samantha Lamora (samantha.lamora@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible

Eileen Xanthopoulos (eileen.xanthopoulos@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible

Rene Motto (rene.motto@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.

19-20: SRE reported 0.4 incidents per 100 students. Fall into the moderate category. Total of 19 reported suspensions (3.9 per 100 students); high category. Ranked 585/1395 in elementary schools in Florida for incidents. Ranked 866/1395 in elementary schools in Florida for suspensions.

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.

We will continue to build positive relationships with all stakeholders by hosting the following events:

Open House
K Open House
K Orientation
Parent Empowerment Night
Curriculum Nights
Third Grade FSA Night
Fall Festival
Cultural Heritage Festival
Student Led Conferences

Students will be recognized through Honor Roll, Perfect Attendance and Leader of the Month assemblies which parents are invited to attend. We will communicate with parents using Progress Reports, Report Cards, Facebook, school marquee, parent newsletters, and School Messenger. SAC and PTO are avenues for parents to become involved in school improvement and supporting the school operations.

- Commitment to utilizing Panorama data to target student groups for Whole and small group SEL instruction from school counselor and school social worker.
- Monthly SEL themes across classrooms and grade levels that incorporate into daily Harmony lessons.

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

School Administration - Principal and Assistant Principal
 Multi-Cultural Committee
 Instructional Coaches - Samantha Lamora and Rene Motto
 Media Specialist - Loriann Foley
 Parent Teacher Organization Members
 School Advisory Council (SAC)

School Counselor- providing the four direct services to all students as needed by gathering data from all sources

School Social Worker- attendance, community resources

Business Partners:

- School Resource Officer- student safety, providing classroom lessons on safety
- Publix - Donations and Math Night Out
- St. Lucie Draft House - Gift Card Donations
- Too Good for Drugs

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |