Mariposa Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mariposa Elementary School

2620 SE MARIPOSA AVE, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/mar/

Demographics

Principal: Brooke Wigginton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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 is pending approval by the St. Lucie County School Board.

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

Mariposa Elementary School

2620 SE MARIPOSA AVE, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/mar/

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	65%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Lucie County School Board.

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.

At Mariposa, we will create a learning community that supports and inspires us to be active learners, problem-solvers and decision-makers. Through work, we recognize that our motivation and effort enable us to accomplish our goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Mariposa, we believe that children and their progress is our primary concern. We strive to create an active learning environment comprised of teachers, students, and parents who honor each other's talents and gifts. We believe that teachers are designers of challenging and authentic work and are engineers of an encouraging atmosphere where students are motivated to take risks, explore innovative ideas, and be effective decision-makers. We believe that students can be more successful when parents become partners with the school. Our mutual goal is to develop each child's positive self-worth, to be respectful of others, and to demonstrate the expectation that learning is a life-long experience that will ensure success.

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
Whitaker, Jane	Principal	Oversees daily operations to ensure the safety and academic success of all stakeholders, oversees school operating budget, Plans for continuous improvements related to school culture and developing strong community support. Serves as Chair of the Leadership Team, determines roles and responsibilities of all other members, creates the agenda, facilitates meetings and decision making, monitors to ensure members serve as instructional leaders in their respective roles, provides Professional Development, conducts classroom walk-throughs and observations and timely, purposeful feedback, participates and monitors team level collaborative planning and provides feedback to aide in improvements of instructional practice to directly impact and increase student achievement. solicits feedback from all stakeholders concerning matters related to the school and shares goals and data with all stakeholders to ensure common vision and common understanding.
Patton, Angela	Assistant Principal	Monitors to ensure members serve as instructional leaders in their respective roles, provides Professional Development, conducts classroom walk-throughs and observations with feedback, solicits feedback from all stakeholders concerning matters related to the school, and shares goals and data with all stakeholders to ensure common vision and common understanding. Oversees the school's discipline and classroom management programs, processes and structures. Supports teachers in implementing best classroom management practices in the classroom
Almeida, Monica	Instructional Coach	Provide support to all teachers through feedback and modeling, participates in collaborative planning, provides professional development on standards with a focus on English Language Arts, assists with assessment creation and lesson plan development, monitors teacher and student data, provides reflective feedback to teachers after classroom walk-throughs, assists teams with the focused, data-driven model, provides mini assessments and resources, assists teachers with tracking student progress through multiple means.
Campbell, Terri	School Counselor	coordinates school, district, and state-based testing, coordinates Problem Solving Team meetings, and ensures PBIS models and processes are followed and oversees the provision of behavioral intervention services. Monitors the processes of MTSS at the school through analyzing progress monitoring data and group creation, provides intervention resources and guidance, ensures fidelity in MTSS instruction. Additionally, oversees compliance of our ESOL program. Monitors the implementation of the Social Emotional Learning Curriculum. Facilitates student support groups to meet the social-emotional needs of all stakeholders

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Spies, Bill		Facilitates IEP meetings, oversees ESE schedules, monitors student services programs and works closely with district-level team to ensure all student needs and accommodations are being met with fidelity as outlined in their Individualized Education Plan.
Henderson, Ashlee	Math Coach	ESE Facilitated Support teachers will collaborate with inclusion classroom teachers to ensure they implement 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.
Stedman, Lauren	School Counselor	Assists in the coordination of Problem Solving Team meetings, oversees PBIS models and processes are followed and oversees the provision of behavioral intervention services. Assists with monitoring the processes of MTSS at the school through analyzing progress monitoring data and group creation, provides intervention resources and guidance, ensures fidelity in MTSS instruction. Additionally, oversees compliance of our ESOL program. Facilitates the SEL curriculum as well as student support groups to meet the social-emotional needs of all stakeholders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Brooke Wigginton

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.*
3

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
50

Total number of students enrolled at the school
700

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

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	105	102	125	119	135	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	709
Attendance below 90 percent	25	22	22	16	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	28	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	18	29	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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
Wednesday 8/25/2021

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	69	93	108	106	95	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	21	6	5	17	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	3	4	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	8	31	15	10	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	1	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	69	93	108	106	95	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	21	6	5	17	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	3	4	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	8	31	15	10	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	1	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				55%	50%	57%	60%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	55%	58%	65%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	54%	53%	63%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	53%	63%	66%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	50%	62%	64%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	42%	51%	51%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	46%	53%	52%	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	57%	50%	7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	55%	16%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	47%	6%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	46%	11%	53%	4%
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 K-5 was iReady Diagnostics. Science progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13%	16%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	15%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	19%
	English Language Learners	0	5%	11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	15%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	13%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	13%	38%
	English Language Learners	5%	5%	5%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75%	72%	97%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76%	74%	87%
	Students With Disabilities	15%	8%	58%
	English Language Learners	64%	64%	76%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71%	81%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	69%	82%	83%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	31%	73%
	English Language Learners	64%	75%	79%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69%	79%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	69%	79%	89%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	58%	79%
	English Language Learners	47%	56%	72%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76%	88%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76%	87%	91%
	Students With Disabilities	67%	74%	90%
	English Language Learners	47%	72%	83%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79%	76%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81%	75%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	44%	36%
	English Language Learners	73%	87%	71%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79%	76%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	79%	76%	79%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	46%	55%
	English Language Learners	57%	62%	71%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64%	64%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	59%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	63%	52%
	English Language Learners	36%	29%	43%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69%	78%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73%	75%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	58%	79%	52%
	English Language Learners	64%	71%	43%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57%	59%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	53%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	53%	77%	41%
	English Language Learners	64%	715	43%

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	31	57	71	38	41	40	41				
ELL	48	44		46	44		38				
BLK	42	52	30	40	39		61				
HSP	46	47	62	46	41	33	41				
MUL	82			64							
WHT	57	65		60	44		61				
FRL	47	55	48	47	40	35	51				

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	27	29	40	42	46	39	16				
ELL	54	64	56	61	56	40	40				
BLK	44	53	40	56	48	47	54				
HSP	52	57	60	61	44	38	47				
MUL	53	82		67	55						
WHT	62	60	52	68	61	53	74				
FRL	52	56	54	62	55	47	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	27	47	50	37	44	41	22				
ELL	35	66	72	59	63	80	23				
BLK	45	56	64	48	57	45	34				
HSP	63	73	68	68	66	68	56				
MUL	63	55		63	55						
WHT	64	66	58	73	67	38	57				
FRL	59	67	66	63	61	50	45				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	44
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	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	73
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	57
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	48
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?

Based on the 2019 raw data from state assessments, the 5th grade students had the lowest percentage of proficient students in ELA and Math when compared to 3rd and 4th grade. Students with disabilities have the lowest percentage of proficiency in ELA, ELA learning gains, as well as Math and Science achievement when compared to the other subgroups.

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

Data from 2019 FSA shows that the area with the lowest performance was in Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25. There has been a negative trend in this area for the previous three years. The area with the greatest decline on our 2019 FSA was in Math Learning Gains. Progress monitoring of Unit Assessments during the 2020 and 2021 school years and 2021 state assessments show Math Learning Gains as an area of greatest need for improvement.

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 include inadequate small group instruction,differentiation and monitoring of all students up to the actual testing days. The transition to virtual learning during the fourth quarter of the 2020 also had a considerable negative impact on student learning. During the last school year families could choose to attend on campus and virtually. The majority of our students in the bottom

quartile started the year virtual. Many of these students lacked the support at home and did not participate at the same level as their peers on campus.

In order to address this need for improvement the leadership team will need to closely monitor the implementation of small group instruction during the math block. Students in the bottom quartile need to be identified and progress monitored through district Unit Assessments and iReady Diagnostic Assessments. Virtual learning is not an option this year, so all students will learn on campus,however support for quarantined students will be essential for preventing learning gaps.

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

In 2019 the area with the most improvement was in Science achievement. Our Science scores have increased over the past three years.

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

The Science Coach worked with the 5th grade teachers and began to work with our 4th grade teachers in the 2020 school year. The coach helped them collaboratively plan to include hands on experiments and activities. The ELA and Science teachers planned together to help integrate science vocabulary and topics during the reading block.

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

In order to accelerate learning and close the achievement gaps that have been compounded by remote learning we will need to have effective collaborative planning, increase student engagement, and consistently implement best practices for differentiation. Progress monitoring will be the responsibility of the leadership team, teachers, and each individual student.

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.

Professional development opportunities will be provided by the instructional coaches, administrators and district support staff. Professional development will include improving student engagement with technology such as Nearpod and Flipgrid. Support and development for small group instruction will be provided to grade level teams as well as one on one coaching as needed.

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

Each student will be provided a data folder for progress monitoring. Teachers will conduct weekly data conferences with students. A data wall will be created and updated throughout the year and will be referenced during weekly data chats with grade level teams. In addition, there will be a continued focus on social and emotional learning. This will be especially important for the students that were off campus for most or all of the previous school year. Support will be provided by the school counselors as well as from the district team.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Significant improvements were made related to support outcomes on the FSAA in 20-21, with one student receiving a level 2 and additional students received a level threes. However, the overarching data across grade levels reflect additional instructional support is needed.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students with disabilities demonstrating learning gains in ELA will increase by 25%.
Monitoring:	Unit Assessment and iReady Diagnostic data will be monitored and reviewed during weekly data chats with grade level teams. This will include monitoring of students with disabilities in each grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning will be on standards based instruction and will include planning for small group differentiated instruction based on data and Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for students to make learning gains on the FSA, students need to be provided with strong standards based instruction that has been collaboratively planned. In addition, using the Achievement Level Descriptors to differentiate instruction will help focus the differentiated instruction for our students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

Support Facilitation teachers will be strategically assigned so that they only support one testing grade level.

Person Responsible	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

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. ESE Support facilitators will supplement classroom teachers in addition to helping students meet their IEP goals.

Person Responsible	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

Instructional coach will support teachers during Collaborative Planning, through feedback of informal observations and by working with targeted small groups.

Person Responsible	Monica Almeida (monica.almeida@stlucieschools.org)

ESE Resource and Facilitated Support teachers will collaborate with inclusion classroom teachers to ensure they implement 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.

Person Responsible	Bill Spies (william.spies@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student outcomes related to Math have reflected that learning gains specifically for the lower 25% have not been met. Data has shown that this needs to be an area for focus for the 2021-22 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	1. Our goal is for there to be an increase in Math Learning Gains by 8% or more. 54% of our students made Learning Gains on the 2019 FSA Math. Our goal is to have at least 62% of our students make gains in math in 2022. 2. The number of students with disabilities demonstrating learning gains Math will increase by 25%.
Monitoring:	Unit Assessment and iReady Diagnostic data will be monitored and reviewed during weekly data chats with grade level teams. This will include monitoring of students in the bottom quartile for each grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The focus of Collaborative Planning will be on standards based instruction. This will include planning for small group differentiated instruction based on data and Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for students to make learning gains on the FSA, students need to be provided with strong standards based instruction that has been collaboratively planned. In addition, using the Achievement Level Descriptors to differentiate instruction will help focus the differentiated instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

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.

Person Responsible	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

Instructional coach will support teachers during Collaborative Planning, through feedback of informal observations and by working with targeted small groups.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

ESE Facilitated Support teachers will collaborate with inclusion classroom teachers to ensure they implement 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.

Person Responsible	Bill Spies (william.spies@stlucieschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This is an area of focus as the BEST standards are new to grades K-2 with a blended implementation for grades 3-5. This will be a school-wide focus as we begin BEST Standards implementation with new instructional resources as well.
Measurable Outcome:	Successful implementation of the new instructional standards will reflect in overall student achievement across all grade levels. Measurable outcomes will include assessment data, progress monitoring data
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through instructional walk-thoughs and classroom observations, data chats to monitor individual student data as well as instructional data to aide in the improvement of instructional practices. Multiple data points will be reviewed, including iReady data, unit assessment data, formative assessments and benchmark data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven small group instruction. Baseline data will be collected at the beginning of the year for reading and writing. This data will be reviewed to provide teachers with specific areas for instruction and remediation. Teachers participate in weekly collaborative planning, which will ensure that appropriate lessons for whole group and small group instruction are purposefully designed to support BEST standards instruction. Small group instruction will be provided by teachers and supported by the literacy coach and reading interventionist in both reading and writing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction that targets specific student needs will provide the necessary support in closing learning gaps, which will ultimately result in learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly Collaborative planning sessions: Teachers and the literacy coach will meet regularly, focusing on using class data to individualize their lessons. They will be guided by Florida's ELA BEST Standards, our District's Instructional Learning Units, Questions and Tasks, and available data from previous assessments

Person Responsible Monica Almeida (monica.almeida@stlucieschools.org)

Small group instruction: Teachers will provide needed intervention or enrichment. They will use formative data collected in class, as well as any available assessment data. Resources will include the Benchmark Advanced Curriculum/Resources, Toolkits, National Literacy Coalition lessons,and Scholastic Guided Reading Program lessons. The literacy coach will provide guidance for choosing appropriate resources for specific student needs. Additional small group instructional support will be provided through Reading interventionist, teacher's aide and ESE Resource Specialist

Person Responsible Monica Almeida (monica.almeida@stlucieschools.org)

MTSS: Students in Tier 2 and 3 will receive remediation on identified skill deficits to help them achieve their learning goals.

Person Responsible	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

ESE Facilitated Support teachers will collaborate with inclusion classroom teachers to ensure they implement 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.

Person Responsible	Bill Spies (william.spies@stlucieschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA data reflected that 45% of students in grade 4 were proficient in ELA. Additionally, the FSA also reflected that 47% of students in grade 5 were proficient in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2022, 51% of students in grades 4 and 5 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and tiered intervention progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our 4th and 5th grade 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. We 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 and 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 instruction. Data will be continually reviewed to guide tiered support for students through the use of iReady data and Unit assessments

Person Responsible	Monica Almeida (monica.almeida@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible	Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible	Monica Almeida (monica.almeida@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

When compared to other elementary schools across the state, Mariposa continues to fall in the "very low" category. Reviewing student and staff survey data, this success is impacted by the positive school culture and environment established. Behavior/discipline data will be monitored to ensure this successful trend continues.

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.

Mariposa strives to build a positive school culture as a PBIS model school, through Social Emotional Learning strategies and aligning to the Kids at Hope philosophy. Our school continues to excel in the state's PBIS program (Positive Behavior Intervention Support) as a model school, achieving the Gold Level Award for the past four years. Our School Psychologist and Assistant Principal oversee the PBIS committee which meets monthly. This committee is made up of representatives from each grade level, our school guidance counselor and is chaired by one of our instructional coaches. Discipline data is reviewed and monthly incentives are determined during the meetings. Committee members communicate with their teams and students to help make decisions about the incentives.The school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing counseling, mentoring and other services.
We believe that when schools and families work together, children have a far better chance of being successful both in school and in life. A strong home to school connection sets the stage for a child who will grow up with a love for learning. Parents and community members are invited to join us at our PTO and School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, curriculum nights, reward ceremonies, parent meetings, and numerous other events and volunteer opportunities.

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

Mariposa's Problem Solving Team (PST) meets regularly. The members include the school guidance counselor, parent, teacher of the child, administration, school psychologist and interventionist. The school counselor refers students in need to the Mental Health Collaborative. BEP (Behavioral Education Plan) and check in check out is offered to students who need behavior interventions. In addition, Mariposa utilizes Too

Good for Drugs, attendance incentives, Ameri-Corps volunteers, and behavior groups (e.g. lunch bunch) to support students routinely. School-wide we have implemented our district's social emotional earning program. The teachers hold daily class meet-ups and utilize lessons from the Sanford Harmony curriculum. Additionally, Mariposa utilizes several components of the "Single-School Culture" to promote consistent expectations across the school campus which we believe promotes a positive school culture/environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**