

St. Lucie Public Schools

White City 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

White City Elementary School

905 W 2ND ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34982

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

Demographics

Principal: Alexandra Laoutas

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2019

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)	93%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: B (55%)
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

White City Elementary School

905 W 2ND ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34982

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

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;">93%</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;">89%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of White City Elementary is to collaborate as a learning organization while engaging the minds of our students every day through quality work. All students will develop to their fullest potential, respect themselves and others, and acquire a love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

White City Elementary School, in partnership with parents and community members, will become a premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. White City Elementary School's name is synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our promise is to focus on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging, and satisfying work for every student, every day. This is the Wildcat way!

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
Laoutas, Alexandra	Principal	
Gieseler, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Trabal, Ciara	Math Coach	
Steele, Danielle	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/16/2019, Alexandra Laoutas

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

458

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

4

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

5

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	85	78	86	80	87	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	41	36	31	21	34	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	2	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	48	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	32	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	5	9	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	2	0	18	35	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Friday 8/26/2022

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	79	83	80	74	103	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	50	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	51	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	0	32	53	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	79	83	80	74	103	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	50	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	51	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	2	0	18	35	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	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	34%	46%	56%				32%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						46%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						42%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	44%	43%	50%				40%	53%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						44%	50%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						45%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	50%	59%				35%	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	29%	50%	-21%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	30%	48%	-18%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

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	43%	55%	-12%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	26%	47%	-21%	60%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	46%	-11%	53%	-18%
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	11	38		22	62		20				
ELL	31	52	60	45	67	70	29				
BLK	34	55	31	37	53	54	34				
HSP	37	58	61	49	63		33				
MUL	33			75							
WHT	27	48		41	75						
FRL	33	55	47	41	60	67	29				

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	5	27			8						
ELL	24	36	55	28	26	33	27				
BLK	16	40	60	21	23		15				
HSP	30	31		33	25	40	32				
WHT	26	15		21	14		29				
FRL	22	33	47	24	24	35	20				

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	3	28	31	20	55	56					
ELL	29	49	45	42	47	50	19				
BLK	26	38	37	34	44	41	39				
HSP	35	60	64	46	43		29				
WHT	40	48		42	48		30				
FRL	31	46	41	39	42	42	34				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	46
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	52
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	54
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	48
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	50
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 learning gains had a decline from the previous year. Math achievement for SWD was lower than other subgroups. Science has a 7% increase from the previous year.

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

ELA learning gains for our bottom quartile, math achievement and science achievement demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Teacher turnover, student quarantines and teacher absences were contributing factors to areas in need of improvement. Actions to address improvement include teacher professional development in math and science content.

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

Math learning gain increased by 39% from the previous year. Math learning gains for the BQ increased by 34% from the previous year. ELA learning gains increase by 22% from the previous year.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement were increased emphasis on the writing process, structured text marking, and intentional small group instruction implementation for the ELA. An emphasis on math manipulatives, and intentional small group instruction were contributing factors for improvement of math learning gains.

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

Small group writing instruction K-5 and school-wide fluency instruction will be needed to accelerate learning. Math fluency K-5 will be need to accelerate learning.

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 provided to teachers include Math Savvas and Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking and improving the collaborative learning and planning process. Ongoing small group reading instruction, writing instruction and phonics professional development will occur throughout the year.

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

There will be a focus on school climate and culture in order to decrease teacher turnover and ensure sustainability next year and beyond.

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 ELA

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 L25 have decreased from 50% to 47%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, ELA learning gains for all subgroups will increase to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through district-created unit assessments, state FAST progress monitoring and by monitoring student work during collaborative planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Reading coach will support rigorous standards-based planning and delivery of content learning. Common collaborative planning focusing on the standards for grade-level instruction. Focus on fluency strategies for grades 2-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Within grades 3-5 ELA, 71% of the teachers have less than 3-5 year of teaching reading instruction in their grade level. The reading coach will support teachers in planning.

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.

Coach and Admin will facilitate collaborative planning.

Person Responsible

Danielle Steele (danielle.steele@stlucieschools.org)

Fluency routine in grades 2-5

Person Responsible

Danielle Steele (danielle.steele@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA. 38% of third-grade students scored at or above a level three. 26% of fourth-grade and 37% of fifth-grade students scored at or above a level three on the 2022 FSA assessment.

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

By the end of 2023, 51% students in grade (identify grade 3,4,5) will show proficiency in ELA.

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

This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring and FAST progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Gieseler
 (lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)

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

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:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

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.

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group using Unit Assessments, K-2 progress monitoring and BAS assessments.

Person Responsible

Danielle Steele
(danielle.steele@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible

Lauren Gieseler
(lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)

#3. 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.

11% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA, 22% of students with disabilities were proficient in math on the 2021-2022 assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of 2023 30% of students with disabilities will show proficiency in reading and mathematics.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using Unit Assessments, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring and FAST progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

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

Math and Reading coaches in collaboration with ESE school-based supports will develop rigorous, standards-based planning and delivery of content with intentionally planned supports for students with disabilities in ELA and Mathematics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Within grades 3-5, 50 percent of the teachers have less than 3-5 years of teaching experience in their grade level. The instructional coaches and ESE school based specialist and VE teachers will provide instructional supports aligned to standards to increase proficiency of students with disabilities (i.e., teacher created notes, fluency in reading and math, pre-reading, and sentence stems).

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.

Monitor weekly lesson plans- alignment to BEST standards, district scope and sequence, and inclusion of practices/techniques matched to needs of students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

Meet weekly for collaborative planning utilizing a planning agenda.

Person Responsible Ciara Trabal (ciara.trabal@stlucieschools.org)

Plan walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of created lessons.

Person Responsible Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor weekly lesson plans- alignment to BEST standard and district scope and sequence.

Person Responsible Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

Meet weekly for collaborative planning utilizing a planning agenda.

Person Responsible Ciara Trabal (ciara.trabal@stlucieschools.org)

Plan walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of created lessons.

Person Responsible Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. 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. 67% of 5th grade students were scored a level one or two on the Science SSA in 2022.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, Science achievement will be 42%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. This area of focus will be monitored using district unit assessments, PENDA reports and classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

Teaching from a range of complex text is optimized when teachers in all subject areas implement the following strategies on a routine basis:

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. Ensuring wide reading from complex text that varies in length.
2. Making close reading and rereading of texts central to lessons.
3. Emphasizing text-specific complex questions, and cognitively complex tasks, reinforce focus on the text and cultivate independence.
4. Emphasizing students supporting answers based upon evidence from the text.
5. Providing extensive research and writing opportunities (claims and evidence).

Hand on lab experiences will also be embedded throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. 50% of the teaches in 5th grade are new to the grade level. Students have not had the hands on experience to build background knowledge. Students often struggle with the reading comprehension and understanding how answer higher level questions.

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.

Arrange for collaborative planning to create lesson to meet the full intent of the standards, with district support. Plan for hand on lab experiences to reinforce standards and concepts.

Person Responsible Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

Utilize J & J Bootcamp materials to provide additional supplemental instruction.

Person Responsible Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@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

In grades Kindergarten through second at White City Elementary the percentage of students, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening assessment, iReady, who were not on track to score a level three or above on the statewide standardized ELA assessment was 43%. The end of year screening data coupled with county-wide progress monitoring data predict a proficiency slightly above the 50% threshold. To maintain this projection and continue to increase student mastery of literacy skills White City Elementary plans to incorporate the following instructional practices; In Kindergarten and first grades (57% on grade level) there will be a focus on explicit and systematic phonics instruction with an intentional emphasis in text and written practice opportunities to build competence and confidence. Teacher training and professional development focused on best practices on phonetic principles and word recognition. In second grade (43% on grade level) interventions will be targeted for students in need of explicit phonics instruction. The grade level and instruction will focus on increased fluency in grade level complex text. Teachers will be provided instructional techniques and resources with a fluency focus. Additionally, text-based comprehension steeped in reading, oral, and written response will be utilized to continue to foster enhanced literacy development.

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

In grades third through fifth at White City Elementary the percentage of students scoring at a level three or above, based on 2021-2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment was 30%. In third grade interventions will be targeted, research based, and explicit designed to address students in need of explicit phonics instruction and reading comprehension. The grade level and instructional practices will focus on increased fluency in grade level complex text. Teachers will be provided instructional techniques and resources with a fluency focus. Additionally, text-based comprehension steeped in reading, oral, and written response will be utilized to continue to foster enhanced literacy development. In grades four (37% on grade level) and grade five (25% on grade level) higher order thinking questions

with oral and written responses will be a focus. Professional development and instructional practices will be aligned to responding to text through questioning, written response, and responding to others.

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)

In grades kindergarten through second at White City Elementary, the percentage of students using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, will increase from 43% proficient or on grade level to 53% proficient.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In grades third through fifth at White City Elementary, the percentage of students using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, will increase from 30% proficient or on grade level to 50% proficient.

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.

White City Elementary will utilize the upcoming FAST assessments to provide ongoing status checks on overall progress towards meeting measurable outcomes. Additionally, the campus will utilize various curriculum-based assessments to provide formative checks on student progress. These assessments, coupled with teacher running records completed quarterly will allow stakeholders to monitor student progress and provide enrichments and/or interventions to ensure goals are obtained.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gieseler, Lauren, lauren.gieseler@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 evidence-based practices and programs implemented to achieve the measure outcomes in grades kindergarten through fifth grade include but are not limited to; the use of Benchmark Advanced, a state approved, core-literacy program designed to meet proficiency goals. Additionally, researched based interventions will be utilized to ensure learning deficits are lessened and student proficiency increased.

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 rationale for selected the practices and programs in kindergarten through fifth grades are evidenced based programs that are designed to address the identified needs of students. The practices selected in White City Elementary's School Improvement Plan have illustrated a proved record of effectiveness for the students served at the school with substations data to support use.

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 will be provided in collaborative lesson planning to ensure grade level measurable objectives are achieved through identified instruction practices.	Steele, Danielle, danielle.steele@stlucieschools.org
Assessment	Gieseler, Lauren, lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org
Professional learning will focus on the instructional practices at each grade level to increase student proficiency.	Steele, Danielle, danielle.steele@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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment by inviting and allowing various organizations to partner with the school to provide resources meeting the needs of students and families.

The United Way of St. Lucie is the lead nonprofit for WCE's Community Partnership School, employing one full time and one part time staff to work with administration to bring funding, services and resources to families, students and teachers. Programs and services are divided into three categories, though not limited to these categories: Family and Community Engagement, Expanded Learning, and Health and Wellness. Through these efforts the school builds positive school culture and environment for families and students.

White City Elementary will host several parent events. Parents, teachers, and community members will be invited to participate in our monthly school advisory council meetings. During the SAC meetings, stakeholders will learn about student achievement goals and our school improvement plan. The SAC will oversee the budget and monitor school improvement targets as we support the needs of our students. We will celebrate literacy week. Monthly evening events will be planning with our CPS partners, 21st century coordinator and our title one liaison.

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

1. On-site Community Partnership Director will support the school with health and wellness initiatives; parent involvement; after school activities; build relationships with parents, staff, community members and students.
2. Teachers will promote a positive school culture by focusing on life skill that build confidence, support mental health, and enable students to overcome challenges.
3. Families will support their children by being involved in school activities.

4. Business/ community partners will help promote a positive culture by donating their time and resources to students.