

St. Lucie Public Schools

Bayshore 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bayshore Elementary School

1661 SW BAYSHORE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34984

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

Demographics

Principal: Chavonn Silas

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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: C (50%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bayshore Elementary School

1661 SW BAYSHORE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34984

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

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

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Silas, Chavonn	Principal	
Seay, Paulette	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/18/2021, Chavonn Silas

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

825

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

2

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

12

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	116	104	124	124	116	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	736
Attendance below 90 percent	39	27	24	21	23	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	41	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	48	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	46%	56%				50%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						56%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						71%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	43%	50%				67%	53%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%						73%	50%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						59%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	50%	59%				56%	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	59%	50%	9%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	63%	55%	8%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	72%	47%	25%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	56%	46%	10%	53%	3%
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	19	41	35	32	59	53	22				
ELL	32	47		37	56	50	21				
BLK	45	47	23	44	61	46	40				
HSP	42	42	35	51	71	67	36				
MUL	67	58		72	75		70				
WHT	52	54	36	71	73		55				
FRL	42	47	36	50	68	54	42				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	44	47	22	44	33	43				
ELL	29	29	20	38	44	60	27				
BLK	42	42	58	36	37	18	35				
HSP	43	52		43	45		43				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	56	50		57	43		57				
FRL	45	47	55	40	38	25	42				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	43	63	37	53	47	23				
ELL	29	52	60	53	73	64	18				
BLK	49	52	75	61	70	71	58				
HSP	52	64	67	74	79	63	56				
MUL	37	50		58	92						
WHT	53	56	81	70	71	40	59				
FRL	47	57	69	64	73	60	54				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	45
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	46
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	68
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	57
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	48
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?

ELA proficiency was 48%, 1% increase from last year. 3rd grade 49 to 51%, 4th grade 48 to 44%, 5th grade 39 to 44%. 4th grade showed a decrease of 5 points from previous year. SWD proficiency stayed the same at 19%, ELL showed a decrease of 3 points from 32 to 29%. Bottom quartile learning gains dropped 22 points from 52 to 30%.

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

Greatest need for improvement is ELA bottom quartile gains and ELL subgroup proficiency/ gains.

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 that contributed to this need were new staff, implementation of new ELA resources, blended year of resources, and lack of human resources. 2022-23 new actions in an effort to address the need for improvement are hiring a Reading coach who will support intermediate grade levels, BEST standards implementation with a continuation of data analysis and schoolwide high effect size strategy of reciprocal teaching professional development. We will also continue implementing CLP protocols and updated CLP schedule for support facilitators.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was Math learning gains with an increase of 28 points. Math CLP's and best practices shared. Math interventionist pulled small groups and was on resource wheel. AP worked closely with interventionist monitoring students progress.

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

We hired a math interventionist and have highly effective teachers in this subject.

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

We will need to monitor student learning and delivery of instruction through CLP's. A new CLP schedule was created to include ESE support facilitators to plan with their inclusion teacher exclusively. Data chats with students using data folders/notebooks. In addition, we will strategically identify and invite students in need of remediation to an after school tutorial program.

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 on LLI, BAS testing will be ongoing for teachers. We will also have biweekly data meetings, where data sets will be analyzed and next steps created for improvement. Prof. development in high effect size strategy reciprocal teaching is on going and monthly NEST meetings provided to new to teaching and SLC on a variety of topics to ensure increased pedagogy.

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

We implemented two new positions this school year that will ensure the sustainability of improvement; those positions are Reading Coach and Behavior Specialist. We will also continue the services of our interventionists and teacher aides.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

This subgroup was identified by disproportionate learning gains on FSA ELA data when compared to their peers.

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

By May 2023, 41% of students in the bottom quartile will make a learning gain on the ELA FAST assessment.
By May 2023, 41% of students in the ELL subgroup will make a learning gain on the ELA FAST assessment.

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

PM FAST assessments
iReady diagnostics
District Unit Assessments
Admin. data analysis
Weekly literacy walkthroughs
Student data conferences

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chavonn Silas
(chavonn.silas@stlucieschools.org)

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

LLI- Tier 2 intervention
Reciprocal Teaching high effect strategy
iReady toolbox

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

Reciprocal teaching has a .74 high effect size
iReady has a .82 effect size to support students making gains

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.

1. Diagnostics
2. Data analysis
3. Benchmark curriculum/ iReady toolbox/ MTSS
4. Teach/ Assess/Reteach
5. Diagnostics, UA , to determine progress

Person Responsible

Paulette Seay
(paulette.seay@stlucieschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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

Benchmark Advance
iReady magnetic foundations
LLI tiered intervention

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

Benchmark Advance
iReady magnetic reading
LLI tiered intervention

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)

FAST PM assessments
iReady diagnostics
Unit Assessments (2nd grade)
STAR assessment

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

FAST PM assessments
iReady diagnostics
Unit Assessments

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.

FAST PM Assessment
iReady diagnostics
Unit Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Seay, Paulette, paulette.seay@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?

Benchmark Advance
Unit Assessments
LLI

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?

Yes, Benchmark advance is a state approved program that addresses the needs of students with disabilities and ELL students. LLI also addresses these needs through intervention.

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
Literacy Coaching- person responsible is Dr. Rebecca Cothorn Dr. Cothorn will collaborate with leaders and teachers to engage in practices such as co-teaching, co-planning, modeling, reflective conversations and data chats.	
Literacy Leadership- Monthly meeting with grade level representatives to discuss trend data and literacy initiatives. We will discuss Glows and Grows from walkthrough data and next steps outlining teacher needs/support.	Silas, Chavonn, chavonn.silas@stlucieschools.org
Assessment- Track data for iReady diagnostics, PM, and unit assessments. Create students data sheets for conferencing. iReady incentives for students with 70% pass rate and 2 lessons passed per week in ELA/MATH.	Seay, Paulette, paulette.seay@stlucieschools.org
Professional learning- person responsible is Dr. Rebecca Cothorn and Chavonn Silas. Our professional development focus for 22-23 is the high effect strategy os Reciprocal Teaching, this strategy was indicated as a desired PD for deeper learning. This strategy has a high effect size of .74.	Silas, Chavonn, chavonn.silas@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.

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

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

All stakeholders including faculty and staff, parents, and community members are responsible for promoting positive relationships and interactions with each other. We operate in a culture of "Teamwork makes the dreamwork", this is personified by staff interactions on a daily basis. We embrace challenges and thrive together!