Morningside Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Morningside Elementary School

2300 SE GOWIN DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Forman, Valerie	Principal	
Turner-Wright, Shauna	Assistant Principal	
Lee, Kristin	Instructional Coach	
Obrien, Jenifer	Teacher, ESE	
Householder, Chad	School Counselor	
Payne, Beth	Teacher, K-12	
York, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Sides, Andrea	Parent Engagement Liaison	
McKenna, Kyle	Parent Engagement Liaison	
Hamblin, Melissa	School Counselor	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We meet with our School Advisory Council each month, which consists of administration, school staff, parents, students, business partners, and community organizations. We discuss current and new curriculum, implementation, and strategies to increase academic achievement and student engagement. SAC members will make suggestions on areas of focus, based on data, as well as strategies for implementation.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Advisory Council will meet monthly to review various high-return on investment data, such as Progress Monitoring, i-Ready, and District Assessments. We will discuss updates from the Curriculum Department, as well Professional Learning and coaching cycles to improve teacher effectiveness.
Our iSucceed team will meet bi-monthly to review identified student data, including academic standing, attendance, and discipline concerns. Data from Reading Rounds will be including as part of our Literacy Leadership Meeting. Faculty Council will meet monthly to review the beforementioned data, as well as Single School Culture and School Climate Surveys.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	66%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	2	37	32	23	25	36	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	8	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	1	17	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	1	19	0	0	23	13	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	39	10	14	13	7	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	34	44	40	36	36	0	0	0	192

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	39	23	22	20	23	0	0	0	128

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	35	41	35	27	19	30	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	6	16	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	2	4	7	4	0	0	0	18

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	5	10	13	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	35	41	35	27	19	30	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	6	16	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	2	4	7	4	0	0	0	18

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	5	10	13	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	66	44	53	75	46	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				80			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			41		
Math Achievement*	80	52	59	79	43	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				73			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			24		
Science Achievement*	74	49	54	65	50	59	65		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	58	59	70			58		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	68			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	64			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	52			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	67			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	69			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	66			80			74					61
SWD	24			56			20				4	
ELL	48			71			60				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			66							3	
HSP	59			81			79				5	62
MUL	42			58							2	
PAC												
WHT	74			84			75				4	
FRL	61			75			67				5	58

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	80	65	79	73	64	65					70
SWD	36	73	69	53	54	50	27					
ELL	74	72		67	69		46					70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	67	50	67	71		47					
HSP	69	73	50	75	72	75	59					65
MUL	50	70		63	80							
PAC												
WHT	83	85	79	84	74	68	73					
FRL	73	80	70	73	68	61	61					65

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71	62	41	74	51	24	65					58
SWD	26	41	31	39	25	17	13					10
ELL	63	55		63	30		50					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	75		50	45		55					
HSP	63	48	30	65	40		59					60
MUL	50			56								
PAC												
WHT	81	68		84	64		78					
FRL	61	53	41	65	45	29	58					63

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	46%	28%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	42%	19%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	48%	52%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	52%	23%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	56%	28%	61%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	48%	32%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	73%	47%	26%	51%	22%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

In the 2023 state proficiency-only model, Morningside Elementary School showed the lowest performance in ELA achievement, earning 69% proficient. Contributing factors to this include teacher effectiveness, weaker foundational reading skills (phonics and vocabulary), and a gap in bridging to B.E.S.T. standards. Additionally, students were impacted by testing fatigue from the increased quantity of questioning and allotted time in a single session. The absence of the writing component factoring into the final calculations may have also been a variable that leveraged overall proficiency in the past.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

In the 2023 state proficiency-only model, Morningside Elementary School showed the greatest decline in ELA achievement, earning 69% proficient, down 6% from the 2022 School Year. In disaggregating the data by grade level. 3rd grade earned 61% proficient, while 4th and 5th grade earned 71% and 75% respectively. This disparity can be attributed teacher effectiveness, limited differentiated instruction, and teacher absence/turnover.
Other possible variables in this decline might be attributed to the shutdown of schools during the

pandemic, at which time our current 3rd grade students would have been in the second semester of Kindergarten, where they segway from non-readers into emerging and beginning readers. Going into first and second grade, many students were still impacted by virtual learning, quarantines, teacher attendance, and limited fact-to-face interactions.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Morningside Elementary School (MSE) outperformed the state proficiency average in all subjects, across all grades. However, MSE showed the least lead in 3rd grade reading, whereas the state proficiency average was 50% and Morningside's Proficiency was 61%, leading above the state proficiency by 11%, while other grades/subjects had a 15-30% lead above the state average. Contributing factors for high student achievement include regularly scheduled MTSS meeting, fluidity in tiered interventions, and quality, small group instruction.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Morningside Elementary showed the most improvement in science instruction, with an 8% increase in proficiency, earning 73% proficient for SY23.Science packets for each unit for every student.
New actions to support this included:
>Packets included articles and CFU's from the 5th grade Science CANVAS class. We used them in whole group and small group instruction.
>Volunteers worked with targeted small groups to review specific articles and CFUs.
>Science vocabulary cards on their center list, along with a Science review flip book. Inspire Science textbooks and journals in small groups.
>Grade level Penda goals developed so that students had to meet in order to attend a Penda Pizza party.
>Teachers sent out quizlet links for each unit, so students could study the unit vocab before a test.
>Teachers provided hands on investigations for each unit.
>Students had 2 field trips that targeted Science standards. (Botanical Gardens and the Indian River Lagoon boat ride through 4H)
>Morningside Elementary promoted the Science Festival and Earth Day festival where 5th grade students hosted a hands-on exhibit about energy. `

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Under the Early Warning System indicators, two areas of concern include the number of students with 10% or more of days absent (187 students) and the 18 students demonstrating a substantial reading deficiency, which will affect their overall success across all subject areas.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase overall Reading Proficiency.
2. Increase learning gains for bottom quartile students in reading and mathematics.
3. Increase proficiency of students with disabilities.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In review of our data from SY23, ELA proficiency saw a decline of 6% from SY22 with an overall proficiency of 69%.

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

For SY24, Morningside Elementary School will increase overall ELA proficiency achievement by 6%, matching SY22 at 75% proficient.

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

F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring 1 and 2, i-Ready fall/winter, unit assessments, and EasyCBM (tiered intervention data) will be monitored through weekly data meetings with grade level teachers and their student support representatives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will be using Benchmark Advanced System for whole group. Magnetic Reading and Ready Teacher Toolbox will be used to provide differentiated, small group instruction. We will use LLI, UFLI, and Benchmark Intervention Kits for tiered intervention. Top Score Writing will be used to incorporate research-based writing support.
We will utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. We also have a school-based interventionist to assist in providing tiered intervention to student and monitor student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI and Magnetic Reading are researched-based resources designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. Our interventionist positions require reading endorsed teachers with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress, allowing for us to meet individual needs for students with reading deficiencies or gaps in literacy skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor implementation of Benchmark Advanced as our Tier 1, whole group instruction and the effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group. Monitor implementation and fidelity of Magnetic Reading as a differentiated, small group instructional resource.

Person Responsible: Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: All classrooms will receive structured weekly Reading Rounds walk-throughs for the first 9 weeks. In quarters 2-4, triangulation of data will guide frequency on individual Reading Rounds, based on needs.

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback. Coaching cycles will be developed based on individual needs.

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

By When: Reading coach will plan with teams weekly for ELA instruction and meet with individual teachers daily during their planning period, based on individual needs and triangulation of data.

Monitor implementation of Top Score Writing.

Person Responsible: Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Walk-throughs will be used to monitor implementation. Monthly writing prompts using state score rubric will be used to monitor effectiveness.

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention.

Person Responsible: Beth Payne (beth.payne@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monthly MTSS Core Team Meetings will be conducted to review data. Quarterly grade-level meetings will be conducted for teacher feedback and review of various data sources.

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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% proficient (for grades 3-5) to greater than 50% proficient and Math Achievement currently at 53% (grades 3-5) to greater than 58% proficient.

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

Through FAST, SLPS District Tests, SPLS Unit Assessments, Data Meetings, IEP Meetings, Goal Setting, and Lesson Plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenifer Obrien (jenifer.obrien@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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. Magnetic Reading, Ready Resources, and Benchmark Intervention Kits, Phonics Skill Bags, and Teacher Created Materials will be used in alignment with state standards and IEP Goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SWD will be provided additional small group instruction in the general education classroom through a double dose of small group instruction. Ready 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When: 9-week ESE Progress Reports using IEP Long-term and short-term goals.

Implement reading and math remediation and additional small group support.

Person Responsible: Jenifer Obrien (jenifer.obrien@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By start of school year, monitored quarterly.

Track student progress on i-Ready, PM1/PM2, District Tests, Unit Assessments, other interventions used.

Person Responsible: Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Weekly data meetings.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Early Warning Systems indicated that 187 students missed 10% or more days in SY23, which has a direct impact to their access to learning and services. 187 students accounted for approximately 26% of student populations.

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

For SY24, we would like to would like to increase attendance rates, with 20% or less of students missing 10% or more of school days.

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

Daily Attendance Reports, Power Bi, Monthly attendance meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shauna Turner-Wright (shauna.turner-wright@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

As our Tier I attendance support, we will promote the SLSP "Showing Up Together," attendance awareness campaign to emphasize the significance of daily attendance and its correlation to student achievement. PBIS Incentives for attendance will be used as part of a goal setting. Monthly iSucceed meetings will be used to track attendance in connection with other Early Warning Systems. In extreme situations, the School Social Worker will conduct home visits and initiate truancy court.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through a strong, tiered system of support and monitoring, we will be able to capture more students in schools as a proactive approach, rather than reactive.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Morningside Elementary will promote "We Belong Together" attendance awareness campaign through monthly posts, morning announcements, and marriquee messaging.

Person Responsible: Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monthly, beginning in August.

iSucceed attendance team will meet monthly to monitor student attendance rates and other Early Warning Systems.

Person Responsible: Chad Householder (chad.householder@stlucieschools.org)

By When: First Monday of each month.

For intensive attendance support needed, School Social Worker will connect with families to meet individual barriers that might be impeding students from attending school.

Person Responsible: Chad Householder (chad.householder@stlucieschools.org)

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

>Addition of Phonics Skills Bags
>Benchmark Spelling & Grammar
>Part Time Interventionist to support with supplemental and tiered support
>Teacher Toolbox for Small Group

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

>Magnetic Reading for Grades 3-5.
>Top Score Writing for Grades 3-5
>Hands-to-Mind Math Kits for 3rd Grade
>Teacher Toolbox for Small Group

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

In grades K-2, 70% or more of our students will be proficient on Start Early Literacy/Reading Instruction.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In grades 3-5, 73% or more of our students will be proficient on PM3 for F.A.S.T. English Language Arts.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

>Unit Assessments, i-Ready Diagnostics/Growth Checks, PM1/PM2, EasyCMB, MTSS progress Monitoring, Other School-based metrics

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Forman, Valerie, valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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?

Magnetic Reading, Top Score Writing, Teacher Toolbox, U-fli, Benchmark Intervention Kits.
All resources are approved for targeted support by St. Lucie Public School Curriculum Department.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The programs were chosen based on a needs to fill in foundational phonics skills while providing intensive support with targeted comprehension skills.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership to Meet monthly, or more frequently, as needed.	Lee, Kristin, kristin.lee@stlucieschools.org
Professional Learning on new resources, as well as differentiated small group instruction.	Lee, Kristin, kristin.lee@stlucieschools.org
Weekly data chats paired with Student Data Notebooks	Forman, Valerie, valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Information from School Improvement Plan and Schoolwide Program Plan will be disseminated to all stakeholder groups through a variety of platforms, including School-based committees and the School Advisory Council (SAC). SAC will meet to review the SIP and SWP, as well as to review the progress

toward meeting this goal each month. Information will also be shared through the school website. SAC and FAC will work together to complete the mid-year Reflection of the SIP.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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. 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. Morning Announcements are streamed daily through Facebook Live, increasing our communication with families while promoting a safe and caring school. Parents, families, and community stakeholders are invited regularly to participate in SAC, volunteer opportunities, or school-based events. Facebook, e-mail, and an online communication platform will be utilized to increase our interactions with families, while demonstrating the high academic expectations we have for our students. For SY24, we have expanded our partnerships by increasing Schoolwide visibility at Mets Stadium Back to School Night, Texas Roadhouse quarterly fundraisers, and Monthly Kona Ice fundraisers. These partnerships within the communities allow businesses to increase their base while providing additional resources back to the school.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

In alignment with increasing our reading proficiency and overall academic achievement for Students with Disabilities(SWD), we plan to strengthen our achievements through a fulltime instructional coach, an additional parttime reading interventionist, strategic scheduling to ensure a maximized, continuum of services for SWD, and protected times for phonics, read aloud, and small group instruction.
To increase opportunity for students receiving access to accelerated curriculum, on top of our self-contained, gifted classrooms, we will implement a "walk-to-math" block for additional 3rd and 4th grade students to receive instruction using the Accelerated Math Placement progression of standards and curriculum.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Morningside Elementary has two School Counselors that have developed a Comprehensive School Counseling plan to ensure that we are meeting the varying needs of a students. A School Psychologist, Mental Health Counselor, and School Social Worker are also used in support of this plan. When more extensive support is needed, students may be referred to community agencies for specialized support.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Morningside Elementary provide a tiered model of academic and behavioral support to ensure all students are being provided with equitable access to education. Our MTS core team consists of School Counselors, an ESE Site-Based Specialist, Administration, Interventionists, an Instructional Coach, and grade band liaisons. This team meets monthly to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of a continuum of tiered services. Based on data, a student may be recommended for a change in tiered intervention, the layering of more intensive interventions, and/or the referral of an evaluation for a suspected disability.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teacher recruitment and retention is one of the largest driving forces in the success of Morningside Elementary. As part of the induction cycle. Teachers and staff are provided with on-going Professional Learning that focuses on precise, high yield strategies for promoting safe and caring schools while increase academic achievement and longterm outlooks. Determination of Professional Learning is driven by a triangulation of data, including academic metrics, Office Disciplinary Referrals, and Progress toward ESE/ESOL plans.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

To assist in the transition from preschool to elementary school, incoming kindergarten students received Summer "Hand to Mind" kits to allow students and families to gain exposure to necessary prerequisite, foundational skills for kindergarten readiness. Additionally, students and families were invited to participate in "Kindergarten Kick-off," providing an opportunity to learn routines, tour the campus, and familiarize themselves with their new learning environments within a kindergarten classroom.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No