

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Allapattah Flats K 8



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Allapattah Flats K 8

12051 NW COPPER CREEK DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34987

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

### Demographics

Principal: Ana Rodriguez Oronoz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Allapattah Flats K 8

12051 NW COPPER CREEK DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34987

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>71%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>75%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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 Allapattah Flats is to develop partnerships that maximize resources to create opportunities for learning in the classroom and beyond. We will provide quality instruction to facilitate academic, emotional, and social growth. We will seek to be innovators, embrace change, and continually evolve in order to guide students in recognizing their personal struggles and interests, and utilize them as pathways to a successful future.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Allapattah Flats vision is to become a center of learning that extends beyond the schoolhouse doors, where students are able to articulate future goals and actively work towards those goals as independent learners.

### 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
Rodriguez, Ana	Principal	Analyze Prior Year and Baseline Student Performance Data and Identify Areas of Growth Monitor Strategic Practice of Interventions Lead Collaborative Learning and Planing Maximize Time on Instructional Tasks, Learning Opportunities, and Resources Implement District Curriculum and Learning Programs Recognize Achievement and Growth
Nelson, Melisa	Assistant Principal	Lead Professional Learning and Planning Analyze Progress, Instructional Needs, and Growth Deliver Professional Development and Support Teachers Evaluate Instructional Practices
Wilson, Rebecca	Reading Coach	School and District Liaison Facilitate Reading Endorsement Courses Deliver Professional Development Support/Mentor New Teachers Monitor New Curriculum Delivery and Use of Resources Facilitate Professional Learning and Planning Model High Yield Strategies in Classrooms Provide Actionable Feedback to Teachers Facilitate Implementation of District Routines for ELA, Math, Science, and Civics
Allen, Jud	Assistant Principal	Lead Professional Learning and Planning Analyze Progress, Instructional Needs, and Growth Deliver Professional Development and Support Teachers Evaluate Instructional Practices
Egan, Sarah	Other	Analyze Trend Data and Current Data to Identify MTSS Groups Deliver Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions to Students Monitor Lowest Quartile and Provide Input for Teachers Model Practice of Tier 2 Programs
Wild-Miller, Melissa	Other	Analyze Trend Data and Current Data to Identify MTSS Groups Deliver Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions to Students Monitor Lowest Quartile and Provide Input for Teachers Model Practice of Tier 2 Programs
Lorrevil, Solange	Other	Create Assessment Calendar Deliver PD for Testing Procedures and Strategies Monitor Testing Accommodations for ELLs, 504 plans and SWD Support and Mentor New Teachers Support 6th and 7th Math CLPs Small Group Support for BQ in Math



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tillberg, Dana	School Counselor	Monitor High School Requirements Coordinate After School Homework Club based on Power if BI Grading Data Plan Interventions for Rtl Behavior and Monitor Growth Design Point Sheets for Students in Check In Check Out Plan and Deliver Interventions for Attendance Collaborate with Project Success, BIC Monitor, Deans, and Sequel Care Counselor
Slater, Melynda	School Counselor	Support Students and Teachers in Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Units Coordinate After School Homework Club based on Power if BI Grading Data Plan Interventions for Rtl Behavior and Monitor Growth Design Point Sheets for Students in Check In Check Out Plan and Deliver Interventions for Attendance Collaborate with Project Success, BIC Monitor, Deans, and Sequel Care Counselor

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Saturday 7/16/2016, Ana Rodriguez Oronoz

**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.*

7

**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.*

27

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

57

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,246

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

17

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

21

**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	83	77	107	101	116	138	136	155	195	0	0	0	0	1108
Attendance below 90 percent	45	34	38	39	51	34	41	69	87	0	0	0	0	438
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	8	9	35	31	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	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	29	25	35	48	73	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	29	22	39	32	51	78	0	0	0	0	251
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	4	5	6	2	85	90	115	0	0	0	0	312

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	2	2	4	16	30	34	64	80	110	0	0	0	0	342

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	2	1	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 8/24/2022

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	80	108	89	109	128	112	136	155	174	0	0	0	0	1091
Attendance below 90 percent	16	31	30	27	25	27	31	45	38	0	0	0	0	270
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	6	8	14	13	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	33	19	24	38	44	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	30	31	22	39	55	0	0	0	0	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	1	2	2	4	23	28	30	0	0	0	0	94

**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	1	21	26	24	28	51	54	0	0	0	0	208

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	80	108	89	109	128	112	136	155	174	0	0	0	0	1091
Attendance below 90 percent	16	31	30	27	25	27	31	45	38	0	0	0	0	270
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	6	8	14	13	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	33	19	24	38	44	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	30	31	22	39	55	0	0	0	0	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	1	2	2	4	23	28	30	0	0	0	0	94

**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	1	21	26	24	28	51	54	0	0	0	0	208

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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%	53%	55%				51%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						56%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						47%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	50%	41%	42%				55%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	54%						57%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						49%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	52%	50%	54%				55%	58%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	55%	59%				73%	74%	78%

**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	58%	50%	8%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	57%	48%	9%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2022					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	52%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

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	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2022					
	2019	54%	47%	7%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
07	2022					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	54%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	36%	34%	2%	46%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	57%	46%	11%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	48%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	72%	67%	5%	71%	1%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	96%	51%	45%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%

**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	18	34	31	20	37	40	27	48			
ELL	35	48	36	38	54	50	48	57			
BLK	40	48	43	39	48	39	38	77	73		
HSP	50	54	41	52	58	54	58	70	74		
MUL	44	50		52	42		54				
WHT	54	48	34	59	59	47	63	72	79		
FRL	44	49	41	44	53	43	47	68	76		
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	15	37	36	19	31	25	25	44			
ELL	35	51	47	43	34	27	36	38			
BLK	39	50	36	37	33	22	38	55	61		
HSP	54	54	47	53	45	28	56	61	60		
MUL	62	56		65	38		55				
WHT	60	56	21	60	53	60	62	82	68		
FRL	45	53	43	46	38	26	47	61	61		
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	20	37	39	22	39	33	22	61			
ELL	35	56	54	38	48	39	50	40			
BLK	46	55	52	50	58	49	44	69	100		
HSP	49	54	42	52	56	57	56	68	95		
MUL	58	53		56	53						
WHT	58	60	44	62	56	34	61	79	91		
FRL	48	55	48	52	55	45	51	70	93		

**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	54
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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%	1
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	



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	52
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?**

Students with Disabilities (SWD) consistently perform below peer subgroups in ELA, Math, Science, and Civics. SWD make up the majority of the Bottom Quartile subgroups in ELA and Math.

Black subgroup of students increase Social Studies achievement from 55% to 77%. Acceleration for Black students increased from 61% to 73%.

Hispanic subgroup of students in the Bottom Quartile increased from 28% to 54%. In Social Studies achievement for Hispanic students went from 61% to 70%. Acceleration increased from 60% to 74%.

White subgroup of students increased Acceleration from 68% to 79%. Math learning gains increased from 53% to 59%.

Students in the Free and Reduced Lunch subgroup increased math learning gains from 38% to 53%. Students in the FRL subgroup in the Bottom Quartile increased from 26% to 43%. Acceleration showed an increase of 61% to 76% for students in FRL.

English Language Learners increased achievement in math learning gains, 34% to 54%. ELL students in the math bottom quartile, 27% to 50%. ELL students increased achievement in Science from 36% to 48% and 38% to 57% in Social Studies.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in ELA and Math performance for Students with Disabilities and students in the Bottom Quartile. Grade level performance data shows the greatest need in 8th grade ELA and Science.

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

Contributing factors include low attendance rates for SWD and students in the BQ during the Covid pandemic. These students also demonstrate low participation rates in virtual and after school tutoring programs. ELA instructional staff struggled to implement new ELA curriculum and literacy routines with fidelity.

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

5th grade Science increased from 44% to 65%.  
Overall Math Learning Gains increased from 42% to 54% and Math Bottom Quartile increased 15% points. Acceleration increased 17% for a total of 79% proficient.  
Civics proficiency increased 8% points to 73%.

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

Science progress may be attributed to theme focused, hands on science tasks and increased use of technology like Nearpod, Study Island, and Penda.

Overall math gains may be attributed to the return to brick and mortar instruction and differentiated instruction guided by progress monitoring.

Civics proficiency may be attributed to stronger collaborative planning, content knowledge, and additional reteaching through critical thinking course guided by progress monitoring.

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

We have an additional interventionist who will target students in 5th - 8th and plan collaboratively with ELA teachers. We also have an additional teacher to provide support in Gen Ed for SWD. These teachers will target students according to progress monitoring. They will deliver interventions for foundational skills, writing, and comprehension. Our Reading Coach will facilitate Reading Endorsement courses for new staff. She will meet with teams to ensure that best literacy practices are implemented and integrated with the new standards and curriculum.

**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.**

Guidance Counselors will monitor attendance and meet with families following Attendance Committee meetings. They will work in collaboration with our School Social Worker to ensure that students in the lowest quartile and SWD are attending school regularly and completing work.

Our Reading Coach will deliver PD sessions to assist teachers with new curriculum resources and scaffolding/planning. She will also facilitate iReady PD with T Otto from Curriculum Associates.

We created a new middle school team to improve student to teacher ratio.

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

The Literacy Team will meet monthly to review walk through data and performance outcomes. We will develop teachers into expert leaders and record modeling sessions of collaborative planning and lesson delivery for future professional learning. We will continue to meet for data chats and MTSS progress monitoring.

**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.**

Students with Disabilities have performed below the 41% threshold for 3 consecutive years.

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

Students with Disabilities will perform at or above 41% in Math and ELA.

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

Teams will begin the year setting goals for each student in the SWD subgroup. Teams will participate in data chats and progress monitoring routinely to analyze performance. Each collaborative team will include, teachers, reading coach, interventionists, ESE support facilitators, SLP staff, and admin. Teachers will plan differentiation in small groups using new curriculum resources and approved supplemental materials.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@stlucieschools.org)

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

In Math, the new curriculum has a focus on fluency tasks, 3 act tasks (real life application), and scaffolded lessons with online tools for remediation and feedback.

In ELA, the curriculum offers close reading and culturally responsive tasks, rigorous text, integration of content areas to build vocabulary and background knowledge, and focus on response to text.

We will plan and practice evidenced based, formal processing strategies like Jigsaw, Reciprocal Teaching, Socratic Circles, Turn and Talk, use of Anchor Charts, and Concept Attainment.

We will open after tutoring to prepare students for the new state assessment.

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

SLPS has adopted new curriculum resources. Teachers are learning new curriculum expectations, best methods to deliver instruction, and effective pacing to ensure mastery.

### 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.

Initial PD for Math and ELA standards and Curriculum - July and August 2022

MTSS Data Analysis/Identify Target Groups - August 2022

Baseline Progress Monitoring and Goal Setting - September 2022

Grade Level CLPs and Data Chats - Weekly

PD Support Sessions - (Formal Processing Strategies, Inclusion Strategies, IEP/Goal Setting) As needed

Progress Monitoring - January 2023

MTSS Data Analysis/Identify Target Groups - January 2023

Progress Monitoring - April/May 2023

**Person Responsible** Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@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.**

ELA proficiency decreased 3 percentage points from 51% to 48%.

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

Increase ELA proficiency to 51%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored using FAST Progress Monitoring, Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, and tiered intervention progress monitoring.

**Person  
responsible for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@stlucieschools.org)

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

Teams will implement BEST Standards for ELA with fidelity in grades K-8. There will be a focus on grade level collaborative learning and planning (CLP) to ensure each stage of the planning cycle is covered to meet the intent of the BEST standards and achieve mastery. Administrators and the reading coach will monitor transfer of lesson plans into lesson delivery and student performance products. Students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will receive interventions with fidelity in all grades K-8, with an added focus on struggling learners in grades 6-8.

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

Teachers need time to collaboratively learn the BEST standards, new curriculum, resources, and supplemental materials in order to plan effectively.

**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.

- Schedule common planning for all teams
- Follow SLPS CLP Cycle Routines
- Analyze Prior Year Data and Identify Target Standards and Target Groups
- Plan High Yield Strategies for Reteaching and Remediation
- Monitor the Implementation using FAST Progress Monitoring, unit assessments, I-Ready Diagnostic, and formative assessments.

**Person Responsible** Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor the implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 Instruction in grades K-5.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Wild-Miller (melissa.wild@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor the implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 Instruction in grades 6-8.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Egan (sarah.egan@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**

APF is not identified as a Raise school

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

N/A

**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)**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**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.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**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?

N/A



**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?

N/A

**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
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

**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.**

- Look at Climate Survey data closely. We identify areas of growth. We meet in teams to create an action plan and find solutions to the issues raised by staff.
- Follow the Kids at Hope framework to ensure that all students have a connection with a caring adult and learn to time travel into future destinations.
- Create and share agreements regarding our Single School Culture routines and procedures.
- Practice Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions with students and staff to maintain an effective, working culture and recognize and celebrate desired outcomes.
- New staff has been trained to implement CHAMPs and STOIC strategies for optimal classroom management.
- School grading philosophy is rooted in opportunities for learning and success, instead of punitive

measures.

- Students will complete the Panorama survey twice a year. Will use results to improve climate and performance.

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

Administrators

Coaches

Guidance Counselors

ESE Specialists

Deans

Teachers

Support Staff