

St. Lucie Public Schools

Morningside 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 |

Morningside Elementary School

2300 SE GOWIN DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

Demographics

Principal: Valerie Forman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 66% |
| 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 (72%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) |
| 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Morningside Elementary School

2300 SE GOWIN DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>66%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>53%</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.

The mission of Morningside Elementary School is to provide all students a safe and positive learning environment, rigorous academic curriculum, and access to technological resources evidenced by continuous student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Morningside Elementary School, in partnership with families and the community, will be an educational institution of academic excellence. Each student will be afforded the opportunity to reach his or her maximum potential to be a successful citizen in the global society.

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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Turner-Wright, Shauna | Assistant Principal | |
| Bolitho, Heather | Principal | |
| Obrien, Jenifer | Other | |
| Lee, Kristin | Instructional Coach | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Valerie Forman

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.*

3

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

648

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 | 118 | 117 | 104 | 104 | 99 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 648 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 35 | 41 | 35 | 27 | 19 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/17/2022

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 | 113 | 102 | 98 | 103 | 104 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 612 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 22 | 19 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 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 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 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 | 113 | 102 | 98 | 103 | 104 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 612 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 22 | 19 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 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 | |

Students with two or more indicators 0 2 1 10 13 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 35

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | |

Retained Students: Current Year 1 2 0 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 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 | 75% | 46% | 56% | | | | 68% | 50% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 80% | | | | | | 63% | 55% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 65% | | | | | | 42% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 79% | 43% | 50% | | | | 74% | 53% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 73% | | | | | | 62% | 50% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | | | | | | 49% | 42% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 65% | 50% | 59% | | | | 49% | 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 | 69% | 50% | 19% | 58% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 51% | 24% | 58% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 55% | 48% | 7% | 56% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -75% | | | | |

| 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 | 81% | 55% | 26% | 62% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 54% | 28% | 64% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -81% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 47% | 6% | 60% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 46% | 2% | 53% | -5% |
| 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 | 36 | 73 | 69 | 53 | 54 | 50 | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 74 | 72 | | 67 | 69 | | 46 | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | 67 | 50 | 67 | 71 | | 47 | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | 73 | 50 | 75 | 72 | 75 | 59 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 70 | | 63 | 80 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 83 | 85 | 79 | 84 | 74 | 68 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 73 | 80 | 70 | 73 | 68 | 61 | 61 | | | | |

| 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 | 26 | 41 | 31 | 39 | 25 | 17 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 63 | 55 | | 63 | 30 | | 50 | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 75 | | 50 | 45 | | 55 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 48 | 30 | 65 | 40 | | 59 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 56 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | 68 | | 84 | 64 | | 78 | | | | |
| FRL | 61 | 53 | 41 | 65 | 45 | 29 | 58 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 24 | 41 | 36 | 30 | 43 | 41 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | | | 68 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | 70 | 43 | 67 | 57 | | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 65 | 65 | 44 | 73 | 70 | 53 | 46 | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | | | 56 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | 60 | 35 | 78 | 60 | 47 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 59 | 43 | 66 | 58 | 46 | 36 | | | | |

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 | 71 |
| 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 | 70 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 571 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 52 |
| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 67 |
| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 78 |
| 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 | 69 |
| 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?

In 2022, Morningside showed growth in six out of seven cells, with the seventh cell (science) maintaining proficiency from 2021. Historically, SWD underperform in comparison to their non-disabled peers. SWD saw increases in proficiency in both ELA and Math in 2022 in comparison to 2021, but they are still underperforming compared to other subgroups.

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

In addition to supporting SWD, a focus on foundational skills demonstrates a need for improvement. The majority of third grade students who did not perform at a level two or higher in ELA had foundational skill deficits, and there are currently identified students in grades 3-5 who are showing deficits in phonemic awareness, phonics/decoding, and fluency.

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

Explicit instruction in foundational skills may have been lost for many students in the primary years due to the pandemic. Daily explicit phonemic awareness and phonics instruction (through Heggerty and Benchmark Advance) provide students with the opportunity to build foundational skills in primary grades to avoid gaps in intermediate grades.

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

Bottom quartile learning gains in both ELA and Math showed significant improvement. ELA BQLG jumped 24 points from 41% to 65%, and math moved 40 points from 24% to 64%.

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

Students in the bottom quartile were identified early and teachers and staff members knew who they were. Data chats and CLPs included a focus on bottom quartile students, ensuring that appropriate supports and re-teach opportunities were in place.

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

Implementation of the new curriculum that aligns with the BEST standards and a continued focus on academic growth.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The instructional coach will facilitate professional development through CLPs, whole group, small group, and individualized trainings. Data chats will be collaborative, looking at individual students, subgroups, classes, and grade levels to discuss how to best meet their academic needs.

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

Full-Day CLPs conducted quarterly.
Addition of full-time instructional coach
Focus on building capacity in teachers and staff.

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.

Data indicates that students are lacking the foundational skills necessary to become fluent readers. i-Ready diagnostic data shows that there is a need for primary students to master their phonics skills.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Foundational skills in kindergarten will increase within phonics on the second i-Ready diagnostic from 53% to 70% mid or above grade level, from 55% to 70% in first grade, and 50% to 70% in second grade.

Monitoring:

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

Foundational skills mastery will be monitored through i-Ready diagnostic data and growth monitoring, Progress Towards Mastery data collection, and unit assessments (second grade). Teachers will participate in data chats with administration and the instructional coach to identify trends and use data to inform instruction. Areas of need will be retaught to improve proficiency within the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Teachers will implement the research-based ELA curriculum with fidelity and reteach foundational skills based on data collection.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is the first year that we are implementing the phonics component of the curriculum to support foundational skills.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Planning for explicit instruction utilizing the B.E.S.T. standards as the focus for student learning during collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible

Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

i-Ready professional development with our district's i-Ready trainer.

Person Responsible

Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Benchmark Advance professional development.

Person Responsible Kristin Lee (kristin.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Regular monitoring of summative assessments.

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

Performing reading rounds and CLP walkthroughs.

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

#2. 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.

Our school will effectively implement the B.E.S.T. standards for ELA. These are new state standards for grades 3-5. Teachers will need to become acquainted with the new standards and align instruction to meet the intent of the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will show growth on their FAST progress monitoring, as well as all proficient students maintaining proficiency on PM3. Additionally, students will continue to show growth on unit assessments of similar text types.

Monitoring:

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

B.E.S.T. standards will be monitored through data from FAST progress monitoring and unit assessments. Teachers will participate in data chats with administration and the instructional coach to identify trends and use data to inform instruction. Areas of need will be retaught to improve proficiency within the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Teachers will provide standards-based differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners. This strategy can be used in both whole group and small group instruction to support learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Differentiated instruction allows teachers to meet the needs of all their students and improve learning outcomes. Benchmark Advance and the i-Ready teacher toolbox have components for incorporating differentiated instruction within the curriculum. It is a strategy that benefits all students and will assist in improving reading proficiency through meeting the diverse needs of students.

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.

Planning for explicit instruction utilizing the B.E.S.T. standards as the focus for student learning during collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible

Kristin Lee (kristin.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Monthly literacy leadership meetings using data to guide instruction.

Person Responsible

Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

i-Ready professional development with our district's i-Ready trainer.

Person Responsible

Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Benchmark Advance professional development.

Person Responsible Kristin Lee (kristin.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Regular monitoring of summative assessments.

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

Performing reading rounds and CLP walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@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.

Analysis of student achievement subgroup data indicates students with disabilities are not achieving at the same rate as their non-disabled peers in reading and math.

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

To increase our SWD ELA, currently at 36% (for grades 3-5) to 50% proficient and Math Achievement currently at 53% (grades 3-5) to greater than 60% proficient.

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

Through FAST, SLPS Unit Assessment Data, Data Meetings, IEP Meetings, Goal Setting, and Lesson Plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenifer Obrien (jenifer.obrien@stlucieschools.org)

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

ESE teachers will work collaboratively with general education teachers to close the achievement gap of SWD. Standards based differentiated instruction will be provided to students with disabilities in order to close the gap between them and their peers. SWD will be provided additional remediation as well as additional small group instruction in the general education classroom. iReady resources on and below level will be used in small group and remediation. Additional intervention resources will be used to meet IEP goals. Flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for student's individual needs will be the school's focus.

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

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.

Identify areas of need for each student.

Person Responsible

Jenifer Obrien (jenifer.obrien@stlucieschools.org)

Collaborative planning between ESE support and general education teachers.

Person Responsible

Kristin Lee (kristin.lee@stlucieschools.org)

Implement remediation and additional small group support.

Person Responsible

Jenifer Obrien (jenifer.obrien@stlucieschools.org)

Track student progress.

Person Responsible

Heather Bolitho (heather.bolitho@stlucieschools.org)

Reteach as needed.

Person Responsible

Jenifer Obrien (jenifer.obrien@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.

Morningside Elementary implements several strategies to create and foster a positive school environment for all involved with the school. Safety and security provide the foundation for everyone who enters the school, with a diverse system of locking and screening procedures. Upon entrance, the school provides a welcoming atmosphere with lively posters, student work, and PBIS posters that highlight guidelines and activities that are partaken by staff and students which builds esprit de corps. PBIS and life skills development programs are also implemented by all the individuals who interact with students, setting the expectations and encouraging the positives capable of every student. All of the administrative and counseling staff implement an open-door policy and deliberately practice socially responsible, emotionally intelligent responses to increase open and accepting communication between all parties. Any issue of concern, whether discipline, academic, behavioral, or personal is approached from a place of caring, asking, "what can we do to best help this individual?" Decisions are collaboratively made to provide the opportunity to brainstorm for the most successful solutions by and with all concerned parties.

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

The first and most essential stakeholders at the school are the Morningside Elementary students. Their role is to learn and grow as individuals and members of the school, individual groups, and the community. The Morningside teachers and all support staff and the frontline of the school. They are responsible for the delivery of content and have the most direct contact with the students daily to ensure they are fostering and creating the most supportive and conducive environments to learning possible. The office and clerical staff have a critical role as they are tasked with ensuring the continuous receiving, classifying, recording, and distribution of student information. They are often the first point of contact for parents, visitors, and stakeholders, and they are the face of the Morningside Elementary. At the administrative level, the principal and assistant principal are responsible for overseeing, supporting, and guidance of all the staff adhering to rigorously high standards set by themselves and those at the district, county, state, and federal levels. Stakeholders outside of the school consist of parents, businesses, community members, and agencies who volunteer or provide their services, time, and materials to enrich and support the work of all Morningside.