

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Frances K. Sweet Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Frances K. Sweet Elementary School

1400 AVENUE Q, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Makeda Brome**

Start Date for this Principal: 10/14/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# Frances K. Sweet Elementary School

1400 AVENUE Q, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

F. K. Sweet is a traditional academic magnet school that maintains excellence by establishing positive partnerships between school, home and community. We take pride in providing all students with the opportunities for success.

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

Frances K. Sweet is a community of students, parents, and staff dedicated to the development of every individual's desire to learn and achieve success. Collectively, we provide a safe and caring environment that fosters a life-long passion for learning.

### 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
Jackson, D'Jion	Principal	
Bolitho, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Green, Decreeta	Teacher, K-12	General Education
Byrd, Edlyne	Teacher, K-12	
Glennon, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Hochberg, Colletta	Teacher, K-12	
Jones, Patty	Teacher, K-12	
Adams, Miesha	Teacher, ESE	
Chambers, Stacy	Other	
Morales-Lopez, Rachel	Math Coach	
Richardson, Ramona	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Saturday 10/14/2017, Makeda Brome

**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.*

1

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

25

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

426

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

8

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

9

**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	70	80	79	86	90	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	12	21	12	14	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	41	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	46	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	21	20	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

**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	5	5	32	41	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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

**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	73	84	81	88	92	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	3	20	19	20	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	68	65	63	69	77	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409

**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	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	73	84	81	88	92	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	3	20	19	20	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	68	65	63	69	77	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409

**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	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	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				57%	50%	57%	57%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	55%	58%	50%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	54%	53%	42%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	53%	63%	59%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				46%	50%	62%	43%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	42%	51%	23%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	46%	53%	43%	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	55%	50%	5%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	46%	-3%	53%	-10%
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-8 was iReady Diagnostics. Science progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25%	20%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	18%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	15%	8%	31%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	11%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	9%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	23%	15%	23%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71%	81%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	76%	83%
	Students With Disabilities	89%	67%	89%
	English Language Learners	60%	80%	90%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	74%	82%	95%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70%	79%	95%
	Students With Disabilities	78%	78%	89%
	English Language Learners	80%	70%	100%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71%	72%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	68%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	50%	70%
	English Language Learners	57%	86%	86%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78%	81%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75%	78%	84%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	60%	90%
	English Language Learners	29%	57%	86%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69%	64%	69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	58%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	46%	64%
	English Language Learners	57%	24%	29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	67%	66%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	62%	80%
	Students With Disabilities	55%	55%	68%
	English Language Learners	86%	57%	77%

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		62%	64%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged		57%	58%	62%
	Students With Disabilities		33%	33%	60%
	English Language Learners		25%	38%	63%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		71%	73%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged		68%	64%	73%
	Students With Disabilities		40%	60%	67%
	English Language Learners		88%	75%	75%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		47%	44%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged		40%	40%	28%
	Students With Disabilities		27%	27%	33%
	English Language Learners		25%	38%	38%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	47	45	11	12	9	13				
ELL	31	69		13			50				
BLK	35	54	50	24	14	6	29				
HSP	46	63		30	19		67				
WHT	68	50		56	30		60				
FRL	36	54	41	25	16	5	35				
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	24	38	29	22	43	40	27				
ELL	53	56	55	60	44	36					
BLK	45	43	36	44	42	30	24				
HSP	67	71	70	65	47	50	25				

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	84	63		80	53		94				
FRL	49	48	38	47	39	35	29				
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	25	15	17	25	10						
ELL	30	64	55	41	36	27					
BLK	46	42	41	50	33	24	30				
HSP	63	70		60	54		60				
WHT	78	58		78	57		55				
FRL	49	46	40	52	39	22	35				

**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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	38
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	32
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	49
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	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	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Data remained relatively consistent from 2018-2019, with slight growth in ELA Learning Gains (3pts) and Math Learning Gains (3pts), growth in Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (15 points), and a slight loss in Math Proficiency (3pts).

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

2019 data shows a need to focus on the academic achievement of our students in the bottom quartile in both reading and math. These were the lowest two cells for FKS, with 42% of bottom quartile students showing learning gains in ELA (12 points below district), and 38% of bottom quartile students showing learning gains in Math (4 points below district). In looking at 2021 data, there is still a need to focus on bottom quartile students in both categories, with a focus particularly in math. In 2021, Math Proficiency in 2021 was at 28%, (down from 56%), Math Learning Gains were at 16% (down from 46%), and Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains were at 5% (down from 38%). Another area for improvement is 3rd grade reading proficiency. In 2019, 3rd grade ELA Proficiency was at 55%; in 2021, 39% of 3rd graders scored at a level 3 or higher (down 16 points).

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

Many factors contributed to the needs for improvement identified above, primarily factors related to the pandemic (i.e.: students and staff out for quarantine, virtual learning, etc.). New actions include the following:

- Addition of instructional coaches with a focus on ELA (Richardson) and Math (Morales)
- Addition of interventionist (Chambers) with a primary focus on Tier 3
- Support from Instructional Partners
- Implementation of LLI and re-implementation of Walk to Intervention

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

From 2018-2019, the largest improvement (15 points) was in Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains. In 2021, FKS saw ELA Learning Gains go up a point to 54% (from 53% in 2019), and ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains fell only 1 point (from 42% in 2019 to 41% in 2021).

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

ELA Learning Gains took place with our two departmentalized 5th grade ELA teachers. Both teachers have a background in ELA, plan effectively, have positive relationships with students, and have high expectations.

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

A clear plan on how to maximize instructional time utilizing research-based strategies to teach to the rigor of the standards while also planning for how to close specific gaps for students performing below grade level.

**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.**

The primary goal this year is to improve Tier I instruction with a focus on collaborative planning. Specific plans will be put in place based on the needs of students performing in the bottom quartile, and 3rd grade students in ELA performing near proficiency.

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

Instructional Partners and Instructional Coaches will support teachers through collaborative planning and the coaching cycle to build capacity.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The goal is to improve Tier 1 instruction in both ELA and Math. With the exception of ELA Learning Gains (up 1 point from 2019), all reporting categories went down in 2021, with proficiency in ELA down 16 points, and Math Proficiency down 28 points. Improving Tier I instruction in these areas will not only have a positive impact on proficiency, but on learning gains as well.

**Measurable Outcome:** The goal is to regain the losses from 2019-2021, with ELA Proficiency rising to 57% and Math Proficiency rising to 56%. In ELA Learning Gains, the goal is to up to 60%, and for Math Learning Gains to go up to 50%

**Monitoring:** iReady Diagnostics and Unit Assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Collaborative Planning, classroom walks, and data chats will be used.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Collaborative planning will be utilized to plan for quality instruction. Classroom walks and data chats will be opportunities to evaluate the implementation and impact of the lessons planned.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Ongoing collaborative planning, facilitated by Instructional Partners and Instructional Coaches with the goal of building capacity.

**Person Responsible** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

Classroom walks to evaluate the implementation of lesson planned.

**Person Responsible** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

Weekly data chats to analyze impact of instruction as measured by Unit Assessments, iReady, and daily Checks for Understanding. Instruction will be modified based on student results and collaboration.

**Person Responsible** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In 2021, 5% of students in the Math Bottom Quartile made a learning gain. This is a drop from 38% in the same category in 2019.

**Measurable Outcome:** The goal is for 50% of students in the Math Bottom Quartile to make a learning gain.

**Monitoring:** Growth for these students will be monitored through iReady Diagnostic and Growth Checks, district Unit Assessments, and classroom-based Checks for Understanding.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The math coach and instructional partner will work with teachers on implementation of best practices in closing the gaps in mathematical foundational skills, including modeling and professional development. Identified students will work with support staff, (i.e.: interventionist), to learn specific skills and strategies needed to access higher level math concepts. Practice in math fluency will be provided to build automaticity with math facts.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Professional Development and utilization of the coaching cycle will build teacher capacity to improve student achievement. Working in small groups to target identified skills and practicing math facts to automaticity will support bottom quartile math students in bridging the gap to access grade-level math skills.

### Action Steps to Implement

Math Coach will identify specific needs of our students in the bottom quartile for math, and work with teachers (via collaborative planning, coaching cycle, PD, etc) to build capacity.

**Person Responsible** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

Data of students in the bottom quartile for math will be closely monitored. Small group or individual support will be provided for identified students.

**Person Responsible** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

Daily fluency practice implemented for identified students.

**Person Responsible** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Third and fourth grade fell below 51% proficiency in 2020.

**Measurable Outcome:** The school plans to improve 3rd grade ELA proficiency by 18 points and 4th grade by 26 points to meet the goal of 57% proficiency.

**Monitoring:** iReady Diagnostics and Growth Monitoring Checks, district Unit Assessments, and classroom-based checks for understanding. K-2 assessments will also be monitored to ensure students are building a strong literacy foundation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Data will be used to provide targeted reading support for students who are near proficiency. The ELA coach and instructional partner will work with teachers on implementation of best practices, including modeling and professional development. Identified students will work with support staff, (i.e.: interventionist), to learn specific skills and strategies needed. Fluency instruction will be implemented to support students in being able to fluently access text to focus on comprehension, and language and editing standards will be explicitly taught with opportunities for practice and feedback.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Professional Development and utilization of the coaching cycle will build teacher capacity to improve student achievement. Working in small groups to target identified skills, focusing on building fluency and stamina, and practicing language and editing tasks will support students near proficiency in building their ELA skills. Benchmark Advance and LLI will be utilized to support these areas.

#### Action Steps to Implement

ELA Coach will identify specific needs of our students near proficiency in ELA, and work with teachers (via collaborative planning, coaching cycle, PD, etc) to build capacity.

**Person Responsible:** Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Data of students in 3rd/4th grade near proficiency in ELA will be closely monitored. Small group or individual support will be provided for identified students.

**Person Responsible:** Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Explicit fluency instruction and fluency practice will be provided regularly.

**Person Responsible:** Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Explicit instruction and practice in language and editing standards will be provided regularly.

**Person Responsible:** Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Foundational literacy skills will be a focus in grades K-2.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on ESSA data, Students with Disabilities at FK Sweet were at 32% on the Federal Index. Black/African American students were identified as well, but as the majority of students at FK Sweet fall into this category, all of the Areas of Focus identified will target this sub-group.

**Measurable Outcome:** Students with disabilities will be held to the same goals as non-disabled peers in regards to ELA and Math Proficiency and Learning Gains (in grades 3-5), and for Science Proficiency in 5th grade.

**Monitoring:** Progress in this area will be monitored via iReady Diagnostics and Growth Monitoring, district Unit Assessments, and school-based standards-based tasks.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will receive intervention and supports to help fill academic gaps and enable Students with Disabilities to access grade-level content.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students with disabilities need targeted interventions and supports to access the same content that is available to non-disabled peers.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Students with disabilities will be included in tiered academic interventions as deemed appropriate based on data.

**Person Responsible:** Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Academic supports and testing accommodations outlined on IEPs will be addressed and revised (via IEP team meetings) in response to student need as identified through data.

**Person Responsible:** Miesha Adams (miesha.adams@stlucieschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

**In comparing discipline data across the state and district to FKS, there were the following areas of focus:**

**\*Decreasing the level 2 offenses by providing support to students as well as staff members.**

**This goal will be achieved by implementing school-wide SEL (via Harmony) daily and through the implementation of the SEL committee, which will address the needs of both students and adults on campus.**

## 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.

Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Harmony will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walkthrough tools. An SEL committee will be established to promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities.

To promote a supportive and fulfilling environment, and have learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, we will ensure that people know their respective roles in relationship to student learning. We will work with district support personnel to cultivate an environment of trust, respect and high expectations.

As a result of this work, our goal is for favorable results in School Climate to increase 15 points to 72%, and for School Safety to increase 6 points to 62%.

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

D'Jion Jackson-Principal  
 Heather Bolitho-Assistant Principal  
 Darryl Wilson-Guidance Counselor  
 Stacy Chambers-Interventionist  
 Melissa Nazzario-Social Worker  
 Miesha Adams-ESE Chairperson  
 Sheila Eassa-School Psychologist  
 Dr. Alison Adler-District Consultant  
 Christina Coppolla-SEL District Contact

A single-school culture will be our focus and emphasis at Frances K. Sweet. To promote a positive culture and environment, we will survey our school key stakeholders. In our initial analysis, we determined that we value these commitments: Compassion (We strive to understand where students are coming from and we meet them where they are at); Professionalism (We conduct ourselves with professionalism inside and outside our school); remember we are role models for our parents and students); Growth Mindset is our middle name (we know that if you believe it, you can achieve it!); Accountability for all of our actions (We believe accountability is taking ownership and responsibility of the task at hand with fidelity); Commitment (We maintain focus on what we are doing and why we are doing it so that our students can be successful).

Monitoring the school culture and climate will allow us to promote a positive school culture and environment. We will have monthly Social Emotional Learning chats to progress monitor.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
2	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
3	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
4	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>