

St. Lucie Public Schools

Mariposa Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (65%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mariposa Elementary School

2620 SE MARIPOSA AVE, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">75%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">69%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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.

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 enables 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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wigginton, Brooke	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.
Stedman, Lauren	School Counselor	Coordinate's 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.
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
Schucher, Michele	Instructional Coach	Provide support to all teachers through feedback and modeling, participates in collaborative planning, provides professional development on standards with a focus on Mathematics K-5, assists with assessment creation and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Durante, Kimberly	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.
Spies, Bill	Other	Facilitates IEP meetings, oversees ESE schedules, monitors student services program(s) 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2022, Brooke Wigginton

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

753

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

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	118	109	110	123	120	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	38	38	29	24	25	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	29	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	31	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	7	8	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	6	6	7	29	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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	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	0

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	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	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	46%	56%				55%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						59%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						55%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	65%	43%	50%				64%	53%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%						54%	50%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						44%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	50%	59%				62%	46%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	71%	55%	16%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	47%	6%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	57%	46%	11%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	26	50	43	46	74	57	23				
ELL	43	62	39	48	74	61	48				
BLK	46	52	43	57	73	59	55				
HSP	52	66	52	57	77	70	56				
MUL	63	91		68	91						
WHT	61	72	67	76	83		68				
FRL	54	66	55	62	78	63	57				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 2022 data from state assessments, we saw growth in all reported areas and subgroups on the 3rd - 5th grade Math Assessment and Science assessment. There was a decrease in the students with disabilities subgroup in ELA proficiency, learning gains and the lower quartile.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Data from 2022 FSA shows that the area with the lowest performance was in ELA Proficiency and learning gains for students with disabilities.

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 blended curriculum of FSA and BEST standards, differentiation and monitoring of subgroup progress on standards-based learning. The transition to in-person learning after a year of blended learning (virtual and in-person) since COVID pandemic began. This created an adjustment period for some students who were returning to in-person learning from virtual the previous year.

In order to address this need for improvement the leadership team will need to closely monitor the implementation of small group instruction during ELA block and increase instructional staff understanding of BEST standards during collaborative learning. Students will be identified and progress monitored iReady Diagnostic Assessments, FAST progress monitoring and school assessments. Additionally, we will increase opportunities for afterschool and Saturday tutoring for students based on data results on FAST progress monitoring and iReady.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In 2022, the area with the most improvement was seen in math for grades 3-5 in accountable the following areas: proficiency, learning gains and lower quartile growth, and all subgroups.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement in math scores include increased small group instruction, tutoring, departmentalization of 4th and 5th grade, student engagement and motivation strategies, and student error analysis of mathematical thinking.

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

In order to accelerate learning and close the achievement gaps we will need to have effective collaborative planning, increase student engagement, create strategic small group instruction and consistently implement best practices for differentiation. We will also provide afterschool tutoring opportunities earlier in the school year.

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 include cooperative learning strategies to increase student engagement and interaction within instruction, BEST standards to increase understanding of new standards, and CHAMPS initiative school-wide to support student engagement.

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

A data wall will be updated throughout the year with FAST, iReady and assessment data. It will be referenced during weekly data chats with grade level teams. In addition, there will be a focus on instruction of the BEST standards and increasing instructional staff understanding. We will also monitor teacher instruction of BEST and provide actionable feedback to deepen teacher understanding.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA learning gains for the bottom quartile have remained at 55% for the past several years. New ELA standards were implemented last year and a new progress monitoring system will be used this year. BEST standards in math are being implemented this year and the focus will be on maintaining the current achievement levels and increasing the ELL subgroup. Math ELL students will be a focus for improvement based on their achievement level.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA will increase achievement levels of the bottom quartile students to 58%. Math students in the ELL subgroup will increase to 48%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

ELA students in the bottom quartile and math ELL students will show learning gains on measured assessments including FAST, I-ready and District created unit assessments. The progress will be monitored during weekly data meetings with teachers, coaches and administrators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Wigginton (brooke.wigginton@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

ELA students will receive instruction in the BEST standards using the gradual release method. Math ELL students will receive instruction using the 5-E model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The gradual release method and the 5-E model will be implemented due to the high correlation to student achievement and retention of knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Collaborative Learning and Planning will be done weekly with instructional coaches to ensure alignment with the district scope and sequence in order to internalize the BEST standards. Kagan strategies will be implemented to support best strategies for student engagement. Weekly data chats will be utilized to engage teachers in error analysis of student achievement.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. The 2022 Science proficiency data increased to match the 2019 results. Based on this data and ELA data for 2022, we see that this area has potential to increase for the 2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Increase science proficiency to 68%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. We will monitor through district assessments and Penda results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Wigginton (brooke.wigginton@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. The focus of collaborative planning will be an emphasis on science vocabulary and standards-based instruction with high-effect size strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. In order for students to become proficient on the 5th grade science assessment, students must be provided with standards-based instruction that emphasizes standards in grades 3-5. Through collaborative planning, instructional staff will design engaging lessons that embed science vocabulary and emphasis on the scientific method.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Weekly collaborative planning to design scaffolded lesson plans with a focus on vocabulary. Data chats held after assessments to monitor students progress on standards.

Person Responsible

Brooke Wigginton (brooke.wigginton@stlucieschools.org)

STEM days, Saturday Science Camp and afterschool tutoring which include hands-on engaging activities will be provided to 5th grade students at various dates throughout the school year.

Person Responsible

Brooke Wigginton (brooke.wigginton@stlucieschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The K - 2 Instructional Practice that we are going to focus on is that of adding more rigor to our phonics instruction. Our data indicates that our 2nd grade students showed 47% proficiency, while our 1st grade students showed 82%. Teachers will meet weekly to discuss student data and collaboratively plan lessons and interventions that will address the BEST standards. Additionally, teachers will attend professional development sessions relating to strategies and resources in phonics instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our previous 4th grade population, now in 5th grade, will be provided with targeted small group instruction using evidence-based strategies. Teachers will also meet weekly to collaboratively plan lessons that will address the BEST standards. Additionally, teachers will attend professional development relating to Kagan strategies and implement these to increase student engagement.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our current second grade students will increase proficiency in phonics by 20%, taking the population's proficiency from 47% to 67%. Progress Towards Mastery probes, iReady, and LLI data will be used to measure progress.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our previous 4th grade population, now in 5th grade, will increase their proficiency from 47% to 52%, as measured by the state standardized assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Weekly Data chats will occur in order to collaboratively discuss best practices to target student needs effectively and in a timely manner. Literacy walks will be conducted by the Literacy Leadership Team to provide feedback in order to increase teacher effectiveness in delivering the ELA BEST standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Patton, Angela, angela.patton@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The ELA Benchmark Advance program is our primary resource for instruction. It aligns with our district's Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan. The resource has been vetted and proven to strongly align with the BEST ELA standards. iReady and additional phonics resources will also be utilized.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Benchmark Advance resource provides a statistically significant correlation to student achievement, and addresses the differentiation needed to target students at all levels.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Collaborative Learning and Planning walk-throughs will be regularly conducted in order to identify trends and provide actionable feedback.	Almeida, Monica, monica.almeida@stlucieschools.org
Teachers will maintain data sheets that will show trends and deficits. Weekly data meetings will be held. Best practices and evidence-based practices will also be shared.	Almeida, Monica, monica.almeida@stlucieschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 Culture and Learning Environment 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. Our School Psychologist, Counselor and Assistant Principal oversee the PBIS committee which meets monthly. This committee is made up of representatives from each grade level, our school counselors and 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 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 offered throughout the year.

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

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, volunteers, and behavior groups (ex. lunch bunch) to support students routinely. School-wide we have implemented life skills education, CHAMPS and PBiS. 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.