

St. Lucie Public Schools

Bayshore 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bayshore Elementary School

1661 SW BAYSHORE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34984

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

Demographics

Principal: Chavonn Silas

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2021

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)	75%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bayshore Elementary School

1661 SW BAYSHORE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34984

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">64%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">73%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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.

Our mission is to prepare our students for the future by providing them with challenging, engaging and satisfying work.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to promote and maintain a climate in which students reach their highest potential with the support of educators, parents, and community.

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
Silas, Chavonn	Principal	
Seay, Paulette	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/18/2021, Chavonn Silas

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.*

5

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

742

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

1

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

3

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	103	115	97	124	157	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	13	18	11	12	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	41	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	48	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

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	71	95	84	106	123	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	3	26	13	20	21	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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	103	115	97	124	157	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	13	18	11	12	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	41	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	40	48	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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				50%	50%	57%	44%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	55%	58%	52%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	54%	53%	56%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	53%	63%	59%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	50%	62%	62%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	42%	51%	46%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	46%	53%	61%	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	59%	50%	9%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	54%	5%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	47%	25%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	46%	10%	53%	3%
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 progeress monitoring was iReady diagnostics.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	20	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	22	33
	Students With Disabilities	11	13	27
	English Language Learners	14	14	14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	14	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	15	31
	Students With Disabilities	11	13	13
	English Language Learners	14	7	14

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75	89	93
	Economically Disadvantaged	72	86	91
	Students With Disabilities	59	81	88
	English Language Learners	50	80	80
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78	84	91
	Economically Disadvantaged	76	83	90
	Students With Disabilities	67	88	88
	English Language Learners	60	70	80

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	74	76	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	73	73	88
	Students With Disabilities	36	33	50
	English Language Learners	43	88	88
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	74	82	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	75	83	91
	Students With Disabilities	39	60	75
	English Language Learners	71	63	88

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71	79	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	70	77	83
	Students With Disabilities	36	42	58
	English Language Learners	41	55	57
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71	80	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	77	83
	Students With Disabilities	52	58	79
	English Language Learners	46	59	71
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59	56	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	53	53
	Students With Disabilities	29	40	33
	English Language Learners	27	38	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75	80	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	74	78	85
	Students With Disabilities	58	60	63
	English Language Learners	53	63	75
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	50	46	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	45	39
	Students With Disabilities	39	25	20
	English Language Learners	20	33	38

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	19	44	47	22	44	33	43				
ELL	29	29	20	38	44	60	27				
BLK	42	42	58	36	37	18	35				
HSP	43	52		43	45		43				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	56	50		57	43		57				
FRL	45	47	55	40	38	25	42				
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	18	43	63	37	53	47	23				
ELL	29	52	60	53	73	64	18				
BLK	49	52	75	61	70	71	58				
HSP	52	64	67	74	79	63	56				
MUL	37	50		58	92						
WHT	53	56	81	70	71	40	59				
FRL	47	57	69	64	73	60	54				
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	20	48	60	27	41	33	33				
ELL	23	56	65	28	52	63					
BLK	41	53	67	55	66	47	39				
HSP	46	64	68	57	58	50	61				
MUL	43	50		57	56						
WHT	46	42	23	67	66	44	76				
FRL	39	51	56	54	61	43	58				

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	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	37
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	36
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	47
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	53
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	42
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?

ELA proficiency and Learning gains trends were low. ELA proficiency was 47% and ELA learning gains was 48% compared to 2019-20 ELA proficiency was 50% and learning gains was 56%.

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

Greatest need for improvement is ELA proficiency, this data component decreased from 3% last year with the biggest deficit in 3rd grade, decreasing 10 points from 59% 2019 to 49% to 2021.

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

Contributing factors were virtual learning and the break in instruction starting in March 2020. New actions that are being taken are specific CLP protocols, new standards and ELA curriculum and human resources such as a math interventionist and teacher aides supporting K-2nd. We will continue to have a strong emphasis on data, interventions and high effect instructional strategies.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was ELA proficiency (still deficient). ELA proficiency was 50% 2019-20. 2020-21 was 47% which was a 3% decrease. We were below district by one percentage point. Other data cells had a larger percentage decrease.

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

Reading interventionist was hired. The role of reading intereventionist allowed for tier three students to be pulled to remediate deficient skills. Reading interventionist also pushed in to classrooms for identified students to pull small groups for identified standard intervention. In addition, we strategically identified and invited 2.2 level students to tutorial program for remediate instructional lessons.

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

We will need to monitor students learning and delivery of instruction through CLP's, Making sure teachers have time to dig deeper into the new BEST standards and curriculum. Provide students with tutorial services after school to decrease achievement gap.

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.

Professionnal development on LLI, BAS testing will be ongoing for teachers. We will also have biweekly data meetings where data sets will be analyzed and next steps created for improvement. Prof. development is on an as needed basis with idiivuidual and groups needs addressed.

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

The additional services we are using are K-2 teacher aides pushing in to support early literacy remediation. We also have quarantined support teachers assisting our students being quarantined.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	BEST standards and curriculum for reading and writing are new to teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2020, 70% percent of students will make a gain or achieve proficiency on the FSA reading assessment.
Monitoring:	iReady diagnostics will be used to monitor for the desired outcome. We will also use Benchmark fluency probes and unit assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chavonn Silas (chavonn.silas@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use iReady which is an evidence based strategy to support our ELA goal.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	.82 effect size has been identified to support students making significant gains through iReady.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Diagnostics
 2. Data analysis
 3. Toolbox strategies/ MTSS
 4. Teach/ Assess/ Reteach
 5. Diagnostic /mini assessment to determine levels of performance gain
- Person Responsible** Chavonn Silas (chavonn.silas@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Decrease in all cells in Math (proficiency, learning gains and bottom quartile).
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, 70% of students will make a learning gain or achieve proficiency on the FSA math assessment.
Monitoring:	iReady diagnostics will be used to determine level of performance followed by using the toolbox for strategies aligned to deficiencies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chavonn Silas (chavonn.silas@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady toolbox and student practice books will be used to support specific skill deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady will be used which has a .82 effect size to support students making gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Diagnostics
 2. Data analysis
 3. Toolbox strategies/MTSS
 4. Teach/Assess?Reteach
 5. Diagnostic/ unit assessments to determine progress
- Person Responsible** [no one identified]

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA. 49% proficient
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2022, 51% students in grade (identify grade 3,4,5) 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:	Chavonn Silas (chavonn.silas@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 Paulette Seay (paulette.seay@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Chavonn Silas (chavonn.silas@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Chavonn Silas (chavonn.silas@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.

Panorama student survey shows that Bayshore students will benefit from support in the area of social awareness, which was a decrease of 2% from Fall survey.

We will use SEL lessons appropriate to student needs. Behavior techs will pull social skill groups focusing on student need and implement SEL activities. Teachers will monitor students through SEL lessons, circles, survey results.

Teacher climate survey showed one element close to 20% needing improvement. That element was leadership consistently enforcing student rules. We've collaborated with teachers and will implement a behavior form so that teachers can make suggestions for student discipline and next steps.

We have been nominated as a PBIS "resilient" school for our outstanding discipline data and initiatives we put in place during the pandemic school year of 2020-21.

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.

Parents receive monthly newsletters sharing every school wide event and notifications and academic supports such as interim reports and report cards. Our facebook page also highlights special events with announcements and photos. Business partners are recognized and celebrated on the school website, facebook, and verbal recognitions.

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

All stakeholders including faculty and staff, parents, and community members are responsible for promoting positive relationships and interactions with each other. We operate in a culture of "teamwork makes the dreamwork", this is personified by staff interactions on a daily basis. We thrive in challenging situations (like a pandemic) and make them the BEST together.

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: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00