Frances K. Sweet Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Frances K. Sweet Elementary School

1400 AVENUE Q, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fks/

Demographics

Principal: Makeda Brome

Start Date for this Principal: 9/7/2018

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)	86%
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 (52%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (45%)
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

Frances K. Sweet Elementary School

1400 AVENUE Q, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fks/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

F. K. Sweet is a traditional academic magnet school that maintains excellence by establishing positive partnerships between school, home and community. We take pride in providing all students with the opportunities for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Frances K. Sweet is a community of students, parents, and staff dedicated to the development of every individual's desire to learn and achieve success. Collectively, we provide a safe and caring environment that fosters a life-long passion for learning.

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
Jackson, D'Jion	Principal	
Adams, Miesha	Teacher, ESE	
Byrd, Edlyne	Teacher, K-12	
Chambers, Stacy	Other	
Glennon, Laura	Instructional Media	
Lewis, Margaret	Assistant Principal	
Morales-Lopez, Rachel	Math Coach	
O'Hanlon, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Richardson, Ramona	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 9/7/2018, Makeda Brome

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

366

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

8

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

10

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	45	67	73	73	70	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	410
Attendance below 90 percent	10	19	14	8	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	8	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	23	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	13	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	13	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 9/7/2022

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	70	80	79	86	90	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	12	21	12	14	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	41	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	46	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	21	20	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	5	5	32	41	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	70	80	79	86	90	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	12	21	12	14	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	41	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	46	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	21	20	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	5	5	32	41	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	42%	46%	56%				57%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						53%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						42%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	43%	50%				56%	53%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						46%	50%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						38%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	50%	59%				43%	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	55%	50%	5%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	46%	-3%	53%	-10%
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	23	68	70	27	47		20				
ELL	50	71		57	53						
BLK	35	63	62	40	58	59	28				
HSP	53	61			63	68		33			
MUL	60			70							
WHT	67			60							
FRL	36	58	60	44	58	53	26				

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	17	47	45	11	12	9	13				
ELL	31	69		13			50				
BLK	35	54	50	24	14	6	29				
HSP	46	63		30	19		67				
WHT	68	50		56	30		60				
FRL	36	54	41	25	16	5	35				

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	38	29	22	43	40	27				
ELL	53	56	55	60	44	36					
BLK	45	43	36	44	42	30	24				
HSP	67	71	70	65	47	50	25				
WHT	84	63		80	53		94				
FRL	49	48	38	47	39	35	29				

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	54
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	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	60
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	52
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	57
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	65
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	64
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	51
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 achievement declined from 57% in 2019 to 42% in 2022 (no test score data in 2020, 2021-no scores published). Although there was a decline in reading proficiency, learning gains (10%) and learning gains in the bottom quartile (17%) increased from the previous year's data.
*There was a -9% difference in math proficiency in comparison to 2019.
*In science, there was a significant difference in proficiency (-10%) in comparison to 2019. The difference in proficiency was a determining factor in the school not moving to a letter grade of "B."

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

The greatest need for improvement, based on progress monitoring (unit assessment data) and state assessment data, is in the area of science for 5th-grade proficiency. In addition, reading proficiency in tested grade levels needs to improve.

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

A lack of strong academic vocabulary, a lack of hands-on experience in science, and difficulty in understanding how to move from concrete to abstract concepts are all contributing factors. The new actions that would need to be taken to address this need for improvement include:
*Exposing students to academic vocabulary in context at the grade level.
*Grade-level, non-fiction text provided to students used with scaffolded instruction to help support students.
*A master schedule that reflects the time for explicit instruction in science at each grade level.
*A revisit of "fair-game" science standards (3rd and 4th grade).

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

Data components, based on progress monitoring (unit assessments, iReady Diagnostics, classroom observations) and 2022 state assessment data that showed the most improvement were the learning gains in ELA and math, as well as with the bottom quartile students in both ELA and math.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement included:
*Regular progress monitoring of student data (iReady Diagnostic, Unit assessment, grades) allowed differentiated instruction to close gaps in student understanding of key concepts.
*Instructional coaches (ELA/math) facilitated Collaborative Learning & Planning (CLPs) with grade groups to ensure lesson development that targeted instruction on grade-level standards.
*Reading interventionist worked with Tier 2 & Tier 3 students providing a triple dose of intervention and support.
*Instructional partnership with district personnel helped with professional development on the gradual release model of instruction.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning include:
*Utilizing a math interventionist to provide tiered instructional support and enrichment for students in grades 3-5.
*Continue regular progress monitoring of students in all grade levels using the Progress Monitoring tools (PM 1-3).
*Monitor the writing component of the ELA scoring grid (including keyboarding skills and utilizing text marking strategies on computer screens/monitors).
*Ensure a strong literacy foundation in the primary grades.
*Continue to build math computation skills in all students (primary grades-addition/subtraction; intermediate grades-multiplication/division).

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school level to support teachers and school leaders include:
*Training and support of BEST standard implementation
*Support on writing framework to implement in the classroom, including comprehension strategies that lead to providing evidence and elaboration within the composed written document.
*Provide training to teachers on computer-based assessment best practices at the elementary level.

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

*Keyboarding skills for elementary students
*Time management on assessments (CBT)
*Flipped gradual release model of instruction/implementation

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 Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The goal for the 2021-2022 school year in science was for 50% of fifth-grade students to score at proficiency levels. This was one of the targeted areas that fell short of the school-wide achievement goal. The 2021-2022 school year, proficiency earned in science was 33% of fifth-grade students demonstrated proficiency in the statewide FCAT science. While progress monitoring student performance data (unit assessments, PENDA science), students were trending closer to the school goal; however, with the test results reflecting 33% of students proficient, this is a critical need for the upcoming school term.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The measurable outcome of the school science goal is that 50% of fifth-grade students will demonstrate mastery of fifth-grade standards, including "fair-game" 3rd and 4th-grade skills.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by the instructional coaches and administrative team. We will utilize the unit assessment data and PENDA reports to target explicit instruction on areas of need.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Utilizing the scope and sequence, teachers will plan units of study designed to have students master grade-level concepts and standards. Instructional coaches, along with administration and teachers, will monitor student achievement data on mastery of the concepts. For standards where at least 50% of students haven't mastered the concept, small group instruction on remediation of skills will be utilized for concept attainment. *FKS will also have a STEAM resource classroom that targets grade-level concepts. The STEAM teacher will focus on areas where students have not demonstrated mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific	PLCs targeting effective instruction in science allow teachers to design units of study for student proficiency levels.

**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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The 2021-2022 school goal for science was for 50% of students to score at proficiency levels. Overall, on the 2021-2022 science portion of FCAT, 33% of fifth-graders scored at proficiency levels. The trend data from unit assessments and PENDA demonstrated a higher percentage of students demonstrating mastery of fifth-grade skills. The area of focus and emphasis around 3rd and 4th grade standards were identified as critical areas of need.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The measurable outcome of the school science goal is that 50% of students will demonstrate mastery of science standards, including "fair-game" 3rd and 4th-grade skills.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress monitoring will occur by instructional coaches and administrative team members through unit assessments and PENDA practice lessons (3rd & 4th grade standards).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	D'Jion Jackson (d'jion.jackson@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 K-2, according to the iReady 2021-2022 reading diagnostic data, 42% of students demonstrated mastery of reading foundational skills. The area of phonics and phonemic awareness were the areas students struggled with the most.

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

The percentage of 3-5 grade students demonstrating proficiency on the FSA reading assessment for the 2021-2022 school year was 42%. Regular progress monitoring of student performance data (unit assessments) provided teachers with data to provide targeted instruction, tiered support interventions, and remediation.
41% of students in 4th grade demonstrated proficiency on grade-level standards (an increase of 14% from the
previous year's student performance
33% of students in 5th grade demonstrated proficiency in grade-level standards (a significant decrease of 20%
points from the previous year's literacy proficiency).
Learning gains and learning gains in the bottom quartile showed significant improvements compared to the previous year's academic data. There was evidence that writing scores contributed to the overall proficiency increase (students demonstrating proficiency in reading comprehension scored a level 6 or higher in writing).

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)

With the new STAR Early Literacy assessment, regular, ongoing assessment is tailored to measure early literacy skills. Generally, students who place Mid On Grade level or above are highly likely to achieve proficiency on state assessments..The following goals are set in Kg.-2nd grades for the 2022-2023 school term:
-Grade K will have 50% or more students demonstrating mastery of grade level phonics/phonemic awareness skills.
-1st grade will increase the number of students mastering pre-literacy skills of phonics and phonemic awareness from 42% to 50% proficiency.
-2nd grade students will increase reading fluency leading to comprehension. 38% of students (former 1st grade will improve with 50% of students demonstrating mastery.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

-Increase the percentage of third-grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points.

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.

Regular progress monitoring will occur by quarterly unit assessments in each grade level. The computer-based assessments (CBTs) will rapidly give teachers access to data to provide remediation and tiered intervention support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jackson, D'Jion, d'jion.jackson@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. §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?

LLI and Reading Horizons are both evidence-based programs that build increased proficiency in phonics and phonemic awareness in primary-grade students and students who lack foundational skills in reading. These evidence-based programs help students demonstrate a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes in reading comprehension. Teachers will receive training and support with using both program sources to improve student reading foundational skills.

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 Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention System (LLI) is an intensive, small-group, supplementary literacy intervention for students who find reading and writing difficult. The goal of LLI is to lift the literacy achievement of students who are not achieving grade-level expectations in reading. To build phonics and phonemic awareness, FKS will utilize a combination of literacy programs to engage students in tiered intervention and remediation. Reading Horizons teaches the elements of structured literacy using instruction that is explicit, systematic, cumulative, and diagnostic.

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
The literacy leadership will plan and implement quality instructional lessons that target learning goals and grade-level standards. Each grade group will meet during resource to collaboratively learn and plan effective lessons. Periodic monitoring of goal attainment will occur with progress monitoring done twice each quarter (unit assessments), and once per semester leading up to the Progress Monitoring done at the state level (FAST). This progress monitoring will be reviewed at regular data chats held with grade groups.	Richardson, Ramona, denise.rodriguz@stlucieschools.org
Literacy Coaching will be provided to teachers to assist with planning, delivery of quality instruction, modeling and support of key literacy standards. The coaching cycle will emphasize the gradual release model of explicit instruction.	Richardson, Ramona, denise.rodriguz@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.

Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Harmony will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walkthrough tools. An SEL committee will continue to be utilized to promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities.

To promote a supportive and fulfilling environment and have learning conditions that meet the needs of all stakeholders, we will ensure that people know their respective roles concerning student learning and achievement. We will work with district support personnel to cultivate an environment of trust, respect, and high expectations.

As a result of this work, our goal is for favorable results in School Climate survey data to increase 15 points to 72%, and for School Safety to increase 6 points to 62%.

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

D'Jion Jackson-Principal
Margie Lewis-Assistant Principal
Darryl Wilson-Guidance Counselor
Stacy Chambers-Interventionist
Melissa Nazzario-Social Worker
Miesha Adams-ESE Chairperson
Nick Kaifas-School Psychologist

Dr. Alison Adler-District Consultant
Christina Coppolla-SEL District Contact

A single-school culture will be our focus and emphasis at Frances K. Sweet. To promote a positive culture and environment, we will survey our school key stakeholders. In our initial analysis, we determined that we value these commitments: Compassion (We strive to understand where students are coming from and we meet them where they are at); Professionalism (We conduct ourselves with professionalism inside and outside our school); remember we are role models for our parents and students); Growth Mindset is our middle name (we know that if you believe it, you can achieve it!); Accountability for all of our actions (We believe accountability is taking ownership and responsibility of the task at hand with fidelity); Commitment (We maintain focus on what we are doing and why we are doing it so that our students can be successful).

Monitoring the school culture and climate will allow us to promote a positive school culture and environment. We will have monthly Social Emotional Learning chats to progress monitor.