

St. Lucie Public Schools

St. Lucie 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

St. Lucie Elementary School

2020 S 13TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathyann Baich Potenza

Start Date for this Principal: 5/27/2021

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)	92%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

This plan 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

St. Lucie Elementary School

2020 S 13TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

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	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

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

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.

Saint Lucie Elementary
Mission Statement

The mission of Saint Lucie Elementary School is to ensure every child succeeds academically, behaviorally, and socially in a safe and secure environment. We provide students with engaging learning experiences to nurture lifelong learners resulting in high levels of academic achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Lucie Elementary
Vision Statement

St. Lucie Elementary will be a student support system designated to create and maintain a prolific learning environment. Each learner will have access to the resources needed to utilize technology and educational materials in an informational society. The infusion of efficient and effective use of all available resources holds particular promise for developing critical thinking skills, problem solving skills, communication skills, creativity, immediate sharing of knowledge and strengthening total learning. These skills provide for empowerment of all learners, thus forming the impetus for building communities of "lifelong learners."

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
Baich, Kathy	Principal	
Reid, Dorcia	Assistant Principal	
Mendoza, Adrienne	Other	
Robinson, Octavious	Dean	
Burns-Wein, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	
Taylor, Jessica	Instructional Coach	
Siders, Chantel	Instructional Coach	
Beckum, Jo	School Counselor	
Cesar, Dominique	School Counselor	
Whitman, Alexandra	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 5/27/2021, Kathyann Baich Potenza

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.*

10

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

716

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

9

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

13

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	108	115	110	102	136	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	666
Attendance below 90 percent	47	64	57	47	56	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308
One or more suspensions	2	9	6	12	26	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	71	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	55	70	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	5	3	57	73	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	187

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	107	114	115	106	136	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	677
Attendance below 90 percent	6	46	41	36	54	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	0	7	7	14	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	3	7	31	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	107	114	115	106	136	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	677
Attendance below 90 percent	6	46	41	36	54	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	0	7	7	14	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	3	7	31	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				31%	50%	57%	21%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	55%	58%	43%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	54%	53%	52%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				39%	53%	63%	31%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	50%	62%	46%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	42%	51%	62%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	46%	53%	28%	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	23%	50%	-27%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	51%	-15%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	48%	-17%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	47%	-14%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	46%	-11%	53%	-18%
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	10	9	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	8	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	18
	English Language Learners	5	5	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	6	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	6	25
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	5	5	25

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7	8	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	9	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	4	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	7	9
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	7	9
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	4	4

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	57	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	36		54
	Students With Disabilities	7	55	23
	English Language Learners	27	28	3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43	61	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	58	71
	Students With Disabilities	19	36	43
	English Language Learners	40	60	79

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	53	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	43	31
	Students With Disabilities	9	45	6
	English Language Learners	24	11	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43	50	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	53	59
	Students With Disabilities	21	16	0
	English Language Learners	42	50	64

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	42	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	39	35
	Students With Disabilities	3	9	15
	English Language Learners	33	46	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51	52	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	49	54
	Students With Disabilities	23	28	25
	English Language Learners	48	46	63
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	25	42	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	40	47
	Students With Disabilities	10	21	28
	English Language Learners	33	55	57

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	18	15	25	21	13	18	23				
ELL	28	61		33	27		25				
BLK	20	35	46	22	26	35	18				
HSP	32	50		35	16		23				
WHT	40			27							
FRL	22	38	53	26	22	32	22				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	23	49	56	31	51	39	21				
ELL	26	56	68	36	48	67	29				
BLK	29	56	68	35	51	58	29				
HSP	34	56	56	40	50	58	39				

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	42	50		68	80						
FRL	30	55	63	37	52	59	41				
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	2	24	38	4	32	58					
ELL	23	52	59	41	51	60	21				
BLK	16	41	56	23	43	65	19				
HSP	30	49	43	44	50	56	48				
MUL	21	30		31							
WHT	24	33		43	47						
FRL	19	41	50	31	45	65	27				

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	31
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	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	34
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
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?

Although in 2019, St. Lucie Elementary made significant gains in all tested areas (ELA, Math, and Science) we continue to demonstrate a gap in the area of literacy as compared to the state averages. Students with Disabilities (SWD) continue to lag behind their peers in the area of ELA proficiency, mathematics proficiency and science achievement in grade 5.

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

Areas have been identified as the greatest areas of need for improvement for St. Lucie Elementary based on the 2019 state assessments: ELA proficiency and learning gains and Mathematics proficiency and specifically learning gains for students in the bottom quartile in the area of Mathematics. 5th grade bottom quartile students contributed to a decline in Mathematics learning gains and bottom quartile learning gain scores.

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

Factors contributing the areas of improvement (ELA) include: the need for the development of strong foundational reading skills in the primary grades (K-2) which contributed to student deficits including comprehension in the intermediate grades. Action steps being implemented to address the need for improvement includes: the adoption of a systematic phonics based program (Reading Horizons) and district-wide literacy curriculum (Benchmark) which addresses all areas of literacy has been implemented for the 2021-22 school year. On-going professional development and instructional coaching to build teacher capacity are additional actions implemented to to address these areas of need. In the area of Mathematics - the implementation of strong CLP structures has contributed to improvements in this area, as well as instructional coaching support and professional learning to build teacher capacity.

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

The greatest gains were demonstrated in ELA: ELA proficiency (+10), ELA learning gains (+13) and the ELA learning gains of students in the bottom quartile (+13).

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

A strong emphasis was placed on writing instruction which had a significant impact on student growth in the area of ELA. Support staff (including instructional coaches, interventionists, resource teachers, and members of the administrative team) worked with students in small groups to provide strategic support in the area of reading.

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

To accelerate student learning teachers will incorporate research based strategies designed to challenge students and help them acquire new levels of understanding. These strategies include

intentional scaffolding; building knowledge and vocabulary; and exposing students to grade level text with appropriate scaffolding and support.

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.

Teachers will be afforded the opportunity to participate in on-going professional learning opportunities including Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and other literacy strategies, professional development related to the newly adopted reading curriculum (Benchmark); data analysis; professional learning from colleagues during CLPs, participation in learning walks and instructional rounds, participation in the coaching cycle and coaching support. Professional learning related to the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model and teacher feedback will be incorporated, as well.

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

Increase the capacity of all teachers through active participation in the CLP process; supporting teachers through affording them the opportunity to participate in the coaching cycle; development of instructional leaders within the school to ensure a pathway of leadership growth and development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Math Proficiency & Learning Gains - The only cell which realized a decrease was math bottom quartile learning gains. This was primarily related to a decrease in learning gains for 5th grade. We recognize a need to make this an area of priority this year with focus on providing support for students with disabilities. The SWD sub-group scored the lowest: math achievement is 31% and bottom quartile is 39%

Measurable Outcome:

Our goal is 65% math learning gains and 65% math bottom quartile learning gains. Our goal for SWD sub-group is 41% for math achievement level and 41% for the bottom quartile.

Monitoring:

On going classroom walkthroughs with specific feedback to teachers; active participation in collaborative planning sessions; instructional coach support logs (evidence of support in the mathematics teachers' classrooms).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Baich (kathyan.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

St. Lucie Elementary will continue to utilize collaborative planning to ensure standards-based instruction and rigorous tasks align. Teams and coaches will more closely examine the resources used to ensure they meet the depth of the standard. Teachers will also conduct data chats- data chats relative to FSA performance and ongoing data chats relative to formative and summative assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

It's essential to ensure the tasks and resources used for instruction align to the test item specs and standards. It's also important students understand their performance on prior assessments and goal set for future assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop collaborative planning schedule.
2. Acquire grade-level core and supplemental math resources.
3. During collaborative planning, examine standards and available resources to determine the most aligned resource, create formative checks for understanding.
4. Monitor checks for understanding for corrective instruction.
5. Conduct ongoing data chats.
6. Implement daily community circles to target SEL learning which has a direct correlation to academic learning in the classroom.
7. Ensure instructional delivery and support for students with disabilities occurs in the least restrictive environment to include support facilitation in the general education classroom.

Person Responsible

Adrienne Mendoza (adrienne.mendoza@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA Proficiency: St. Lucie Elementary has witnessed increases in all ELA cells, however there remains a need for additional increases in ELA proficiency with focus on providing support for students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome: St. Lucie Elementary will reach 40% in ELA proficiency - an increase of 9 percentage points.

Monitoring: On going classroom walkthroughs with specific feedback to teachers; active participation in collaborative planning sessions; instructional coach support logs (evidence of support in the mathematics teachers' classrooms); monitoring of student achievement data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathy Baich (kathyan.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: St. Lucie Elementary will implement school-wide standards-based instruction for ELA and reading fluency process in all grades. Using grade-level adopted literacy program and its corresponding resources to collaboratively plan for whole group and small group reading instruction, develop a common school-wide writing plan and structure, and ensure data chats with students are scheduled. Implement Leveled Literacy Intervention with fidelity in K-5 classrooms to support reading instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All of these components will contribute to increased reading proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop school-wide ELA Standards-based Instructional and reading fluency plan.
2. Schedule collaborative planning times to develop Standards-based lesson plans for whole group and small group reading instruction.
3. Acquire grade-level core and supplemental resources for small group reading instruction and tasks.
4. Develop school-wide writing plan and structure.
5. Schedule FSA and ongoing data chats after unit assessments.
6. Implement daily Harmony Circles to target SEL learning which has a direct correlation to academic learning in the classroom.
7. Ensure Standards-based instructional delivery and support for students with disabilities occurs in the least restrictive environment to include support facilitation in the general education classroom.
8. Implement Leveled Literacy Intervention Reading intervention support during the MTSS block.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Burns-Wein (rebecca.burns-wein@stlucieschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Using Panorama Data - School Safety & Social Awareness were areas of concern. Students felt that other students negative behaviors affected their safety at school. Social awareness was also a concern yielded from the Panorama data. Students felt as though that students do not respect one another and respect one another's differences.
 Using Discipline Data - data indicates that 55% of black males and 36% of black females at SLE received at least 1 or more BIRS during the school year.
 School Climate Data (Faculty/Staff) - Area of Concern: Discipline officers in my school communicate with me on my discipline issues (Fall 2020 3.89 - Spring 2021 3.56)

Measurable Outcome:
 By the end of the 2021-22 of the school year, 80% of the students will be able to define and identify social awareness behaviors within the school and classroom. Students will demonstrate an increase in favorable responses in Student SEL Competencies (Social Awareness) and Students Supports & Environment (School Climate and School Safety). SLE Teachers will provide tailored, individualized support and feedback to enhance their growth related to SEL and ensure fidelity of implementation of the Harmony curriculum with the principles of SEL embedded throughout the school day.
 2021-22 school year, St. Lucie Elementary will establish a SEL/Discipline Committee to address on-going concerns as they related to student discipline and the communication of disciplinary action and monitor SEL data at St. Lucie Elementary in an effort to support SEL school-wide initiatives.

Monitoring:
 -Administrators will conduct on-going walk throughs during Harmony Circles to ensure the fidelity of implementation of SEL lessons.
 - Administrators and instructional coaches will participate in and support collaborative planning sessions for SEL lesson plan; as well as monitor lesson plans in Planbook.
 -On-going analysis of Panorama data (fall & spring) to adjust action plan needs based on real-time data.
 On-going monitoring of SEL school-wide activities to ensure effective implementation.
 -Establishment and monitoring of meetings/minutes of both the St. Lucie Elementary Discipline Committee and Social Emotional Learning Committee.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
 [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
 -Focus on evidence-based strategies to support the implementation of SEL at St. Lucie Elementary.
 - Monthly SEL school-wide activities and focus on the 5 SEL Competencies and support the effective implementation of PBIS.
 - Celebrate and recognize student SEL characteristics throughout classrooms and school wide. (Morning announcements; Rising Star of the Month, "Golden" STARbucks).
 -Daily student and staff participation in Harmony curriculum through Harmony Circles/Meet Up.
 -5th grade SEL support through resource rotation provided by school guidance counselors

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 All of these components will contribute to the social and emotional well-being and growth of the adults and children at St. Lucie Elementary.

Action Steps to Implement

- SLE will provide time for collaborative planning with a SEL focus to ensure a fidelity of implementation of the Harmony curriculum, as well as elements of Social Emotional Learning embedded throughout the day across campus.
- Provide Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Professional Development Re-Boot to ensure a school wide implementation of the SEL principles with fidelity.
- Schoolwide plan for monthly SEL activities and events.
- Planbook to include written lesson plans for SEL implementation by grade level.
- Section of the weekly staff newsletter designated for SEL updates and recommended SEL activities and data.
- ESE Inclusion Teachers, ESE / Instructional Paras and Instructional Coaches will provide support for SEL in designated classrooms around campus to ensure an inclusive environment and to support the fidelity of implementation of SEL at St. Lucie Elementary.
- On-going classroom walkthroughs to support the fidelity of implementation of SEL programs at St. Lucie Elementary.

Person Responsible Kathy Baich (kathyaann.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org)

#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.
 3rd Grade-21%
 4th Grade-17%
 5th Grade-22%

Measurable Outcome: By the end of 2022, 51% of students in grade 3 will show proficiency/growth in the area of ELA.

By the end of 2022, 51% of students in grade 4 will show proficiency/growth in the area of ELA.

By the end of 2022, 51% of students in grade 5 will show proficiency/growth in the area of ELA.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored using Unit Assessment data, i-Ready diagnostic assessments and growth monitoring checks, K-2 monitoring assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathy Baich (kathyann.panusbaich@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 Kathy Baich (kathyann.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Kathy Baich (kathyann.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Kathy Baich (kathyann.panusbaich@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.

In 2019, St. Lucie Elementary reported a rate of 9.7 suspensions per 100 students as compared to the state average of 3.7 suspensions per 100 students. St. Lucie Elementary yielded a ranking of #1213 out of 1394 elementary schools. This was noted as being very high. Upon further investigation, it has been noted that nearly 55% of our Black males and nearly 36% of our black females in the 2020-21 school year received discipline referrals.

The administrative team will work closely with faculty and staff to provide ongoing SEL and equity trainings to ensure diverse practices and inclusivity for all students. A SEL/discipline committee has been formed to review ongoing historical discipline data in an effort to develop intervention strategies for students and teacher in an effort to reduce the disparity of discipline infractions highlighted in this report and to reduce the overall number of disciplinary incidents.

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.

St. Lucie Elementary implements daily social-emotional learning Harmony Circles grounded in the core competencies outlined by the CASEL SEL framework: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, responsible decision making. This systematic approach emphasizes the importance of establishing equitable learning environments across all settings contributing to student growth socially and emotionally, as well as academically. The SEL team (inclusive of guidance counselors, TSAs/Deans, Administrators and Instructional Coaches) monitor the implementation of the SEL Harmony curriculum and the principles of the CASEL framework. Utilizing Panorama survey data for students, the SEL team at St. Lucie Elementary ensure they are closely monitoring the needs of students and intervening when necessary.

By monitoring school climate survey data, the administrative team closely analyzes the needs of the faculty and staff and makes the necessary adjustments needed to ensure a positive school culture and environment.

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

Kathy Baich Potenza - Principal - implement and monitor SEL programs and data related to school culture and climate.

Dorcia Reid, Assistant Principal implement and monitor SEL programs and data related to school culture and climate.

Adrienne Mendoza, TSA implement and monitor SEL programs and data related to school culture and climate.

Octavious Robinson, TSA - monitor discipline data and work with students and their family to develop positive school relationships; chair PBIS committee.

Dominique Cesar and Jo Beckum - Co-chair SEL committee and meet with students regularly to help develop a positive school culture and climate for all students.

Teacher - implement school-wide Harmony and SEL curriculum.

Students - engage in SEL activities

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00