

St. Lucie Public Schools

Samuel S. Gaines Academy Of Emerging Technologies



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Samuel S. Gaines Academy Of Emerging Technologies

2250 S JENKINS RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

<http://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/sga/>

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.

Samuel S. Gaines of Emerging Technologies is a STEM Magnet. We will provide the instructional building blocks to develop lifelong learners and 21st century global citizens. Students will become critical thinking problem solvers who work collaboratively to improve the world around them. An engaging learning environment will promote student leaders who are capable of making evidence based decisions and develop multiple solutions for complex real world situations.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the use of cutting-edge technology and an integrated, multidisciplinary approach to teaching and learning, Samuel S. Gaines Academy of Emerging Technologies will provide a rigorous and innovative academic program, while creating the blueprint for STEM education within St. Lucie Public Schools

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
Davis, Keith	Principal	
Rodriguez, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Davino, John	Assistant Principal	
Cuccurollo, Kerrie	Reading Coach	
Powers, Michelle	Math Coach	
Layer, Priscilla	Other	Collaborating with teachers to understand students' needs Creating assessments to evaluate students' abilities and needs Developing intervention strategies to help students improve their reading Identifying and working with students that may require intervention assistance
Paul, Erin	Other	Collaborating with teachers to understand students' needs Creating assessments to evaluate students' abilities and needs Developing intervention strategies to help students improve their reading Identifying and working with students that may require intervention assistance.

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.

SGAET Leadership Team met with feedback from teachers to create SIP
 SGAET shared SIP with SAC/ members for ratification
 SGAET shared SIP during faculty meeting
 SGAET shared SIP with PTO

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))

SGAET Leadership will review SIP Goals progress after diagnostics and PM state assessments.
 SGAET will make necessary adjustments with student schedules and CLPs.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	84%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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: B 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	10	22	13	15	17	23	27	33	20	180	
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	2	2	6	8	13	7	43	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	17	10	8	0	0	0	1	0	36	
Course failure in Math	0	19	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	22	6	3	13	19	32	43	19	157	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	22	16	18	10	18	35	38	17	174	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	23	23	19	24	42	45	43	25	253	

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	38	25	17	17	33	43	46	22	242

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	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3

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	14	14	11	18	32	34	10	38	42	213	
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	6	15	25	5	30	20	106	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	35	42	7	33	15	132	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	38	55	11	24	15	151	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	0	3	2	3	33	65	54	162	

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	3	1	6	39	50	18	55	40	212

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	14	14	11	18	32	34	10	38	42	213	
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	6	15	25	5	30	20	106	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	35	42	7	33	15	132	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	38	55	11	24	15	151	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	0	3	2	3	33	65	54	162	

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	3	1	6	39	50	18	55	40	212

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	49	50	53	48	53	55	42		
ELA Learning Gains				56			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			52		
Math Achievement*	54	51	55	53	41	42	42		
Math Learning Gains				60			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			49		
Science Achievement*	53	52	52	50	50	54	43		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	71	68	83	55	59	66		
Middle School Acceleration	85	75	70	94	50	51	85		
Graduation Rate		90	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		69	53		74	70			
ELP Progress	39	44	55	69	78	70	50		

* 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	622
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	56			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	72			

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%
FRL	56			

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	41			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	63			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	60			

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	49			54			53	71	85			39
SWD	34			40			31	50			6	33
ELL	34			45			33	66	85		7	39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			50			51	64	76		7	48
HSP	46			52			48	72	88		7	37
MUL	72			78							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	63			68			73		83		4	
FRL	46			51			49	70	84		7	39

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	48	56	56	53	60	53	50	83	94			69
SWD	35	44	35	38	48	39	27	63				44
ELL	41	52	55	50	58	50	38	80	94			69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	52	60	43	54	42	43	77	100			74
HSP	48	55	51	56	62	58	53	82	96			68
MUL	50	80		83	80							
PAC												
WHT	56	64		63	62		59	100				
FRL	44	53	54	48	56	52	48	80	94			69

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	42	54	52	42	48	49	43	66	85			50
SWD	26	42	42	28	54	48	26	37				33
ELL	34	53	60	36	38	38	28	64	67			50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	51	51	32	41	43	33	62	90			32
HSP	44	56	56	46	47	39	42	71	81			55
MUL	44	57		50	64							
PAC												
WHT	54	54	36	59	68	86	63	58	91			
FRL	41	54	54	40	46	46	41	64	83			53

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	36%	46%	-10%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	43%	6%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	43%	15%	47%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
06	2023 - Spring	44%	42%	2%	47%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	53%	42%	11%	50%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	40%	48%	-8%	54%	-14%
07	2023 - Spring	58%	38%	20%	48%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	52%	12%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	56%	2%	61%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	43%	19%	55%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	48%	-9%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	57%	41%	16%	44%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	51%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	34%	53%	50%	37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	39%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	66%	4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	63%	*

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.

ELA- We have an upward trend in proficiency.

Math- We have an upward trend in proficiency.

Science & Social Studies have maintained an upward trend in proficiency

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in both Math and ELA.

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.

The contributing factors for this need for improvement was the transition back to brick and mortar education and new ELA Curriculum for the district. Our action to address this need for improvement is a focus on curriculum instruction through Professional Learning and Collaborative Learning and Planning with Instructional Coaches. In addition, we have a K-4 ELA Interventionist and a 5-8 ELA Interventionist who will work closely with our Tier 3 students to increase learning gains. In math, we will use iReady/ Saavas to support students on their pathway to increase their level and achieve learning gains. We will further use that data to provide small group support.

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

Science showed improvement compared to previous years cohorts.

The contributing factors for the improvement were the focus on vocabulary using real world solutions. Camps supporting content areas during summer and prior to testing. Lastly, Penda was implemented as an additional support for students in 5th and 8th grade Science.

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

Attendance
ELA & Math Proficiency

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

3-8 Writing
Math Proficiency
ELA Proficiency
Attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Even though we have a very positive culture and environment, there's always more that we can do. Our climate surveys have shown that our teachers and staff are generally happy to work at our school and we want to keep it that way, and even improve our employees' job satisfaction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will be looking for a 5% increase on our overall climate survey ratings.

Monitoring:

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

We will be looking for an improvement on our teacher/staff climate surveys put out by the district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@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 are re-instating teacher and staff leaders of the month, weekly unofficial mini-gatherings, and monthly fun group activities outside of school for team-building and bonding. In addition to these, every employee has their own QR code posted outside their room/office for others to quickly provide positive feedback and praise for them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By increasing the number of positive exchanges and interactions between employees and directed to employees, we believe we will have happier employees.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Differentiated instruction will be utilized during the Reading Block and MTSS intervention.

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

Differentiated instruction will be utilized during the Reading Block and MTSS intervention.

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

50% of students in grades k-2 will be on grade level by the end of the 2024 school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% of students in grades 3-5 will be on grade level by the end of the 2024 school year.

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.

Students in grades K-2 will make learning gains based on iReady and FAST Progress Monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rodriguez, Amy, amy.rodriguez@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?

We are using Florida Benchmark Advance and iReady as our evidence-based programs.

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?

These are the programs that are provided by the district to address the areas of need

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
Weekly Literacy Walks with Leadership team to observe whole group and small group tier 1 instruction. Identify instructional strategies to support for coaching cycles and Professional Development opportunities. Weekly Collaborative Planning for teachers with Instructional coaches to review standards and best practices Tracking of daily checks for understanding by teachers, discussed during data chats Weekly Data chats to review tier 1 data with all grade levels. Schedule Professional development throughout the school year based on observations.	Rodriguez, Amy, amy.rodriguez@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.

Links to our SIP and data demonstrating our progress will be on our school webpage. A presentation summarizing our SIP and progress throughout the year will be provided to parents as part of our initial Title 1 presentation in conjunction with Curriculum night in September and subsequently during our Family Lighthouse (PTO) meetings. The same plan will be used to share and disseminated information to the community through SAC beginning in August.

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))

Communication regarding our monthly family events and our Family Lighthouse Meetings (PTO) will be on school webpage and pushed out through our school's social media. Additionally, at every event, beginning with Open House, families will receive information about how to join our Family Lighthouse Team which includes adding them to our Family Lighthouse Team on Microsoft Teams. Our goal is to increase family participation and build learning partnerships with our school families. Additionally, each teacher and staff member is committed to supporting the needs of our students. Each grade level has developed their family communication plans which includes phone call, emails, Class Dojo, Remind App, and Skyward.

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))

Content and Academic support in Resource Elective Classes

STEM integration, particularly technology to increase student engagement and track progress

Grade level and Vertical (across grade levels) collaborative planning regrading content standard, best practices, strategies to maximize instruction

Provide professional development to teachers and staff, followed by support from instructional coaches as needed, focusing on academic areas of need, such as math small groups and the new writing curriculum

Learning Walks- Teachers are able to observe their peers implementing different instructional strategies

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