

St. Lucie Public Schools

Rivers Edge Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 25 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 25 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 28 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 30 |

Rivers Edge Elementary School

5600 NE SAINT JAMES DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

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.

At Rivers Edge Elementary, all students will be provided challenging, engaging and satisfying work, which meets their individual differences and abilities ensuring their success each and every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the caring, cooperative efforts of parents, staff and community, all students at Rivers Edge Elementary will be successful. They will be challenged, engaged, and satisfied with the learning opportunities provided to them.

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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Ingersoll, Jennifer | Principal | |
| Avellino, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | |
| Johnson, Kelly | Math Coach | |
| Mardis-Romano, Natasha | Reading Coach | |
| Jaramillo, Elena | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Hodgson, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Rocco, Kerri | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Slappey, Christine | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Slappey, Artis | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Fawcett, Allison | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Doole, Gail | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Jackson, Claudia | School Counselor | |
| Morosco, Samantha | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Griffiths, Zoie | 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.

All stakeholders have been involved in the process of the SIP development. Input has been generated through careful review of school-wide academic and behavioral data.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement on students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement. This will occur through our schoolwide data chats of formative and summative data from the classrooms, district-based assessments (grades 2-5) and statewide progress monitoring tests. In addition, we will monitor the effectiveness of our Tier 1 supplemental interventions, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions throughout fidelity walkthroughs and monitoring meetings led by our schoolwide interventionists.

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 | 64% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 76% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| 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: B |
| 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 | 3 | 30 | 23 | 27 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 13 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 20 | 2 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 21 | 9 | 6 | 29 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 34 | 15 | 24 | 15 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 6 | 35 | 30 | 40 | 38 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 | |

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 | 0 | 41 | 19 | 44 | 26 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |

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 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 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 | 0 | 34 | 25 | 19 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | |

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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |

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 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 0 | 34 | 25 | 19 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | |

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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |

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 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 44 | 53 | 52 | 46 | 56 | 54 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 54 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42 | | | 40 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 60 | 52 | 59 | 57 | 43 | 50 | 58 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 65 | | | 59 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56 | | | 46 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 61 | 49 | 54 | 61 | 50 | 59 | 66 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 59 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 52 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 42 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 74 | 58 | 59 | 56 | | | 56 | | |

** 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) | ATSI |
| 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 | 291 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 450 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 95 |
| 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 | 41 | | | |
| ELL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | |
| FRL | 55 | | | |

| 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 | 37 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 45 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |
| MUL | 42 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | | | |
| FRL | 55 | | | |

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 | | | 60 | | | 61 | | | | | 74 |
| SWD | 23 | | | 39 | | | 36 | | | | 5 | 73 |
| ELL | 27 | | | 43 | | | 50 | | | | 5 | 74 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | 55 | | | 48 | | | | 5 | 79 |
| HSP | 39 | | | 48 | | | 59 | | | | 5 | 68 |
| MUL | 41 | | | 59 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | | | 71 | | | 73 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 47 | | | 55 | | | 56 | | | | 5 | 71 |

| 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 | 52 | 61 | 42 | 57 | 65 | 56 | 61 | | | | | 56 |
| SWD | 20 | 34 | 25 | 38 | 44 | 33 | 39 | | | | | 60 |
| ELL | 28 | 46 | 43 | 33 | 66 | 53 | 33 | | | | | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 58 | 56 | 45 | 66 | 65 | 52 | | | | | 47 |
| HSP | 47 | 59 | 38 | 47 | 66 | 50 | 56 | | | | | 61 |
| MUL | 31 | 50 | | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 67 | 36 | 71 | 63 | 47 | 71 | | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 59 | 43 | 50 | 62 | 60 | 59 | | | | | 58 |

| 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 | 54 | 54 | 40 | 58 | 59 | 46 | 66 | | | | | 56 |
| SWD | 18 | 44 | 36 | 39 | 38 | | 25 | | | | | 60 |
| ELL | 37 | 43 | | 40 | 57 | | 57 | | | | | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 50 | | 48 | 44 | | 67 | | | | | 50 |
| HSP | 48 | 48 | | 52 | 58 | 36 | 59 | | | | | 57 |
| MUL | 53 | | | 57 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 57 | 46 | 68 | 62 | 64 | 67 | | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 51 | 40 | 53 | 55 | 45 | 61 | | | | | 55 |

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 | 48% | 46% | 2% | 54% | -6% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 52% | 6% | 58% | 0% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 42% | 4% | 50% | -4% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 48% | 52% | 54% | 46% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 52% | 12% | 59% | 5% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 56% | -1% | 61% | -6% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 48% | 4% | 55% | -3% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 47% | 7% | 51% | 3% |

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.

Our bottom quartile in Reading did not reach 50% learning gains on FSA in the 2021-2022 school year. Per our iReady progress monitoring, our ESE student are underperforming when compared to unidentified students.

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

Reading L25% has been consistently below 50% learning gains. This cell has down 15% as compared to 2019. Our ESE subgroup has been identified in ESSA as underperforming

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.

Our Math L25% showed the greatest gains from the previous year.

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

The school was able to maximize the use of an experienced ESE teacher as a Support Facilitator to math classes with SWD. In addition, we continued our departmentalized structure in 4th and 5th grade, which allowed our teachers to continue to build the experience and effective cooperative learning structures. Before/Afterschool tutoring targeted L25, as well as SWD, utilizing experienced teachers in the field. Coaching feedback cycles supported continuous improvement. Targeted small group instruction to remediate and strengthen skills.

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

- Student absent 10% or more days
- Level 1 achieved on a state-wide assessment-ELA
- Level 1 achieved on a statewide assessment-Math

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

Continued implementation of Benchmark Advanced curriculum to support needed growth in ELA for L25 and demographic subgroups across all grade levels. Continued implementation of SAVVAS Realize curriculum to provide quality, standards-based instruction for math. Reading Coach and Teacher on Special Assignment to support alignment and rigor. Reading and Math Interventionists to provide support for tiered interventions and progress monitoring. LLI and Benchmark Advanced intervention will be used to provide tiered instruction. ESE Teachers will plan with instructional coach. Additional School Counselor to support students' mental health needs, as well as monitoring of individual academic needs. Teachers will participate in learning walks to observe highly effective teachers.

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.

Our ELA bottom quartile performed at 42% making learning gains, and 21% of students received a Level 1 on Florida Standards Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal would be to have 15% or less of student achieve a Level 1 on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.)

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using PM1/PM2, Unit Assessment, iReady diagnostic, and Tiered intervention progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@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 Advance System for tier I instruction, differentiated small group instruction and tiered interventions for tiers 2 and 3 students. Also, we will use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. 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.

In addition, we will utilize Benchmark Start Up (K-1) and Spiral Up (3rd grade) Phonics skill bag resources to reinforce deficit phonic skills. Magnetic Reading is a Grades 3–5 reading comprehension program that connects the art of teaching with the Science of Reading to develop successful, proficient, and confident readers. Lastly, we will utilize the Top Score writing program to enhance the writing ability in grades fourth and fifth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmark Advance is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention 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 position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress. All 4 ESE Teachers who support English Language Arts are Reading Endorsed.

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 and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier I instruction and differentiated small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year

Monitor the implementation and effectiveness of standard based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions..

Person Responsible: Alexis Ashbrook (alexis.ashbrook@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year

Develop coaching cycles that provide opportunities for teacher to observe classrooms of highly effective teachers.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Provide on-going Professional Learning and support for B.E.S.T., Benchmark Advance, LLI, BAS, and Success for All.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Life skills and character development effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and achieve positive goals, develop and manage effective character traits, establish and maintain substantial relationships, and make responsible decisions. Research demonstrates that Life skills and character development promote academic success and increase positive behavior, while reducing misconduct, substance abuse, and emotional distress for elementary school students. Given the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on school routines and access, family norms and dynamics, and social interactions among peers and the community, it is critical that school address the possible life skills, social, and mental health needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will demonstrate a 10% increase of positive responses on Emotional Regulation from the Spring 2022 Panorama student survey to the Spring 2023 Panorama student survey.

Monitoring:

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

Area of focus will be monitored using classroom walkthrough data on Single School Culture, CHAMPS, Office Disciplinary Referral Data, and iSucceed pragmatics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@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.)

Teachers and staff will implement the Single School Culture and CHAMPS curriculum across all grade levels and classroom settings

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Studies suggest that students participating in both the cooperative learning activities and CHAMPS curriculum benefit both socially and academically. The studies reveal promising gains in life skills, character development and academic performance over those in control groups.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Provide Professional Development in C.H.A.M.P.S. Classroom Management Plans.

Person Responsible: Kelly Johnson (kelly.johnson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By October 2024

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of C.H.A.M.P.S. Classroom Management Plan developed collaboratively by teachers.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Monitor iSucceed Plan to support individual students showing one or more Early Warning Signs in the area of attendance, grades, discipline and suspensions.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Implement and monitor effectiveness of Comprehensive School Counseling Plan to support life skills and character development of students

Person Responsible: Claudia Jackson (claudia.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

Implement and monitor effectiveness of Comprehensive School Counseling Plan to support life skills and character development of students

Person Responsible: Claudia Jackson (claudia.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

Monthly Professional Development for i-Succeed Plan and Implementation

Person Responsible: Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monthly throughout the 2023-24 school year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Our math proficiency was 57% per Florida Standards Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal would be to increase math proficiency to 70% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitor using PM1/PM2, District Cumulative Assessments, i-Ready Diagnostics/Growth Monitoring, and other other classroom assessment metrics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@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.)

Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support with transitioning to B.E.S.T Standards, SAVVAS Realize, differentiated instruction. collaborative planning, and student engagement. In addition, there will be an additional 30 minutes of math instruction per day for our 3-5th grade students and we will utilize the research-based math program, Athletics. Through this program students will be provided additional math practice all while teaching them that the preparation required to be a good athlete also required them to be a good student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement, highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then all stakeholders will increase individual ownership; therefore, students will leave their grade level demonstrating at least a year's worth of growth.

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.

Teachers will be provided with on-going Professional Learning and support in the transition to B.E.S.T. Standards and the new adopted SAVVAS Realize Curriculum.

Person Responsible: Kelly Johnson (kelly.johnson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction utilizing B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction utilizing B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation feedback

Person Responsible: Kelly Johnson (kelly.johnson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Monitor pacing and implementation of daily, small group, differentiated instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Monitor data of computer-based District Cumulative Assessments, iReady diagnostic, PM1/PM2 data, and other classroom metrics

Person Responsible: Kelly Johnson (kelly.johnson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

Monitor data of computer-based District Cumulative Assessments, iReady diagnostic, PM1/PM2 data, and other classroom metrics

Person Responsible: Kelly Johnson (kelly.johnson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

#4. 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.

One or more grades (3,4,5) are at or below 50% for proficiency in ELA. 5th grade is at 50%, identifying Rivers Edge as a RAISE School.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of 2022, 51% or more of students in each grade (3, 4, and 5) will show proficiency in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using PM1/PM2, Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, K-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@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.)

Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan) - Use Benchmark Advance System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. - Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. -Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmark Advance is our peer-reviewed adopted core instruction materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention 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 position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress

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 and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group using monitoring tools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments)

Person Responsible: Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

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

Person Responsible: Alexis Ashbrook (alexis.ashbrook@stlucieschools.org)

By When: This will occur throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Providing coaching support in the development of differentiated, small group lesson plans to meet individual needs based on reading level.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Coaching cycle and classroom observations of highly effective teachers for ELA teachers with <3 years teaching experience.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By January 2024

Use of coaching support and planning for implementation of high yield literacy strategies, including collaborative conversations, cooperative learning structures across all areas, use of graphics organizers for recording and representing new and deepening knowledge, and use of strategy-based anchor charts.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Use of coaching support and planning for implementation of high yield literacy strategies, including collaborative conversations, cooperative learning structures across all areas, use of graphics organizers for recording and representing new and deepening knowledge, and use of strategy-based anchor charts.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

#5. 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.

SWD consistency underperform in the areas of ELA proficiency, ELA LG, and ELA L25%, as compared to other subgroups and Gen Ed population. SWD did not score above the threshold on the Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD will increase in all categories by at least 5%, as measure by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking and i-Ready Diagnostics.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using PM1/PM2, Unit Assessment, iReady Diagnostic, and Tiered intervention progress monitoring. BAS will be use to diagnose and monitor specific deficiencies and provide remedial support. Stretch Growth in i?Ready will determine success of Bottom Quartile Learning Gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@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.)

Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support and implementation with fidelity of differentiated small group instruction, Tiered intervention, collaborative planning, and student engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement, highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then SWD stakeholders will increase individual ownership; therefore, all SWD will leave their grade level demonstrating either meeting grade level expectations or 1year's worth of growth.

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.

Provide on-going Professional Learning and support for B.E.S.T., Benchmark Advance, LLI, BAS, and Success for All

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

To provide professional learning opportunities for cooperative learning as a high effect size strategy.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

To provide professional learning opportunities for cooperative learning as a high effect size strategy.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Avellino (jennifer.avellino@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

Coach and Support ESE Support Facilitation Teachers with the development of high-quality, standards based lesson plans to close the opportunity gap.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: by January 2024

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based differentiated small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

Monitoring of data with teachers to discussed individual student learning needs and next steps with strategies for improvement.

Person Responsible: Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

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).

The process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. As a ATSI school we have worked collaboratively with our district office and school advisory council to focus on allocating funds based on the greatest needs of our school, students and teachers.

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

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students in grades K-2 had 51% or more of students proficient in each respective grade.

Kindergarten was 62% proficient per STAR Early Literacy

1st grade was 55% proficient per STAR Reading

2nd grade was 67% proficient per STAR Reading

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

Students in grades 3-5 experienced significant learning loss as a result of the Pandemic. School cultures, online learning, blended models, and limited home support were contributing factors to deficiencies in literacy. Deficiencies in literacy have ripple effects across all subject areas. One or more grades (3,4,5) where 48% or more of its respective students scored below a proficient level 3 on the 2022-2023 Florida Standards Assessment in English-Language Arts. 3rd grade had 53% scoring below a level 3 and 4th grade had 42% of students score below a level 3. Identifying us as a RAISE School, 5th grade had 50% of students score below a Level 3 on the Florida Standards Assessment.

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

Although K-2 was not identified to have a RAISE grade, we will continue to monitor PM1/PM2, Unit Assessments, i-Ready, and Tiered intervention data

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

53% of 3rd grade and 50% of students in 5th grade scored below proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment for 2022-2023. By the end of 2024, 51% or more of students in grade 5 will show proficiency in ELA as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored using PM1/PM2, Unit Assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, K-2 Monitoring Assessments, and tiered intervention progress monitoring

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ingersoll, Jennifer, jennifer.ingersoll@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?

Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to

Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan) - Use Benchmark Advanced System for whole

group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. - Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. -Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons, including ESE Support Facilitation Teachers

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?

Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention 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 position is a Reading Endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress. Our ESE Support Facilitators for ELA are all reading endorsed, as well.

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 |
|--|---|
| Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention, ensuring interventions are aligned with SLPS Reading Matrix of approved, research-based interventions. Provide on-going Professional Development opportunities to support implementation. Implementation of Tier 3 interventions provided by a Reading Endorsed teacher. | Ingersoll, Jennifer, jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org |
| Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback. Literacy Coach will support CLP Process to ensure alignment with B.E.S.T. Standards, fidelity of adopted reading curriculum, and best practices for classroom instruction. Coaching cycles will be utilized to support teaching/learning through observation of other classrooms, peer feedback of mentor teacher and scaffolding of instructional literacy coach. | Ingersoll, Jennifer, jennifer.ingersoll@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.

There will be multiple ways that the information regarding the SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to Stakeholders will be disseminated. This information will be shared on several social media sites including the school website, ClassTag, and the school's Facebook page. In addition, this information, whenever possible, will be shared in multiple languages.

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))

Rivers Edge has had a strong support from our parents and community business partners. With the onset of COVID, our opportunities to host family and community events has been limited to after school activities or online until it is safe to have events on campus during school hours. In response to these restrictions, we have increased our digital outreach through posting of school events on Facebook. As we transition back to normal activities, we provide a blended model of opportunities for involvement, allowing us to reach more families. In addition, we are increasing our communication through sending monthly school newsletters via email to families. ClassTag, E-mail, and School Messenger are utilized to provide on-going communication of events or happenings around Campus and in classrooms. Fortunately, we were able to have an in-person Open House, which was attended by around 80% of our families. In addition, to primary grade level, Rivers Edge choral, and school-wide musical performance, we have several major family events that encourage parents and families to participate with the school:

- Family Read Aloud Nights (digital)
- Title I Parent Night
- Hallowingo Night
- Kids@Hope Night
- Curriculum Night
- ESOL/ESE Night
- Student Led Conference Night
- Science Night
- Spring Fling
- Publix Math Night

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)

The school's comprehensive master schedule will effectively align staff resources to the needs of ESE students. This is addressed through including ESE teachers in grade level CLP's, schedule ESE SF teachers to support during differentiated instruction, and supporting all ESE reading teachers to have their reading endorsement.

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))

Our fifth-grade students will be participating in the Too Good for Drugs program.

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))

Our school has two full time school counselors that coordinate small group counseling and mentoring programs to improve student's skills outside of the academic subject areas.

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).

Rivers Edge Elementary is a PBIS and CHAMPS school. Specific work is done daily to teach and reinforce the school-wide expectations as well as behavioral expectations in the classroom through out CHAMPS program. A token-economy system is used through our PBIS program whereas students can earn and participate in extrinsic rewards for following school-wide expectations.

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))

Weekly data meetings are held at Rivers Edge elementary involving administration, academic coaches and teachers. Through these meetings we determine celebrations and next steps for our data driven instruction. Monthly meetings are hosted through our beginning teacher (SHINE-NEST) program with new teachers and veteran teachers to our school district. All NEST participants are assigned a mentor and New Educator Support Team (NEST) are held throughout the year in an effort to recruit and retain effective teachers.

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))

At Rivers Edge we have one VPK program. We are so fortunate to be able to retain most of the VPK students into our K-5 elementary school. This is the result of VPK families being highly satisfied by the social, behavioral and academic growth made by students that they chose to retain their children at Rivers Edge.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$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.

Yes