Southport Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Southport Middle School

2420 SE MORNINGSIDE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

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.

Our mission is to inspire and empower compassionate, global learners who are committed to creating a better and more peaceful world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In partnership with parents and community, Southport will become the premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. Southport's name will be synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our school's promise is to move from good to great, focusing on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for each student, every day. This is the St. Lucie Way!

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
Seal, Susan	Principal	
Roy, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Hawkey, Patricia	Other	
Bargeron, Carla	Instructional Coach	
Mananowski, Vivana	Administrative Support	
Bernard, Mildred	School Counselor	
Parks, Yolanda	Dean	
Carey, Nicholas	Dean	
Cusa, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	
Brugnone, Diana	Other	
Johnson, Eric	Teacher, K-12	
Koch, Pamela	Teacher, Adult	
Cannon, Heather	School Counselor	
Saunders, Jean	Teacher, K-12	
Soledad , Solange	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Stakeholders are an essential component of the learning community and providing feedback towards the School Improvement Process (SIP). The process in two-fold. Their input is provided through the School Advisory Council where components of the SIP are shared along with data to support the decisions made for continuous improvement. During SAC meetings, teachers, parents, students, and community business partners vote upon the components of the SIP and come to a consensus on additional action steps needed to support student achievement. In addition to SAC, our Faculty Council meets regularly and votes on pertinent information for the SIP.

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 of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap, by engaging in an on-going data disaggregation process with stakeholders and correlating the achievements or lack of to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This will be done through grade level meetings, data chats, faculty meetings, and SAC meetings. To ensure continuous improvement, the plan will be revised through analyzing wat the areas of concern are and developing new implementation steps that will be purposeful in targeting the areas of focus.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	71%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	91	105	263
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	55	82	151
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	37	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	34	55
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	85	98	242
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	69	80	214
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	103	105	295

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	0	0	0	0	0	83	130	145	358

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	84	87	79	250
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	77	58	204
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	26	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	81	59	200
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	75	59	217
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	78	125	310

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	126	109	357

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	84	87	79	250
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	77	58	204
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	26	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	81	59	200
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	75	59	217
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	78	125	310

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	126	109	357

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

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*	43	36	49	48	39	50	49		
ELA Learning Gains				50			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			35		
Math Achievement*	43	37	56	47	37	36	44		
Math Learning Gains				59			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			38		
Science Achievement*	36	32	49	52	39	53	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	51	50	68	59	52	58	64		
Middle School Acceleration	64	74	73	70	48	49	64		
Graduation Rate					39	49			
College and Career Acceleration					53	70			
ELP Progress	35	23	40	24	79	76	38		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	272
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	516
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	25	Yes	4	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	56			
BLK	43			
HSP	43			
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	53			

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	44			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	57			
BLK	50			
HSP	52			
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	50			

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	43			43			36	51	64			35
SWD	18			25			22	35			5	25
ELL	29			47			18	44	50		6	35
AMI												
ASN	53			59							2	
BLK	33			33			28	52	68		5	
HSP	40			42			33	50	60		6	35
MUL	38			40			35	28			4	

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	53			48			44	56	63		5	
FRL	40			40			32	47	66		6	37

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	50	47	47	59	60	52	59	70			24
SWD	18	34	31	26	51	58	19	36				
ELL	39	48	39	44	69	70	37	57				24
AMI												
ASN	64	50		55	60							
BLK	38	48	43	39	57	64	45	48	68			
HSP	47	53	47	48	62	60	47	61	76			22
MUL	42	42	17	36	57	46	45	44				
PAC												
WHT	57	50	64	52	56	64	62	67	66			
FRL	42	48	50	42	58	61	50	53	68			24

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	49	45	35	44	39	38	50	64	64			38
SWD	19	39	39	23	35	35	23	50				30
ELL	38	43	43	34	35	24	19	40	40			38
AMI												
ASN	40			70								
BLK	37	38	33	34	31	30	40	55	56			
HSP	51	45	36	43	38	41	52	56	57			36
MUL	41	36	20	30	32	30	43	70				
PAC												
WHT	56	48	35	51	44	44	55	74	76			
FRL	46	45	35	38	36	32	45	61	55			38

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
07	2023 - Spring	40%	43%	-3%	47%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	43%	-4%	47%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	40%	42%	-2%	47%	-7%

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	44%	48%	-4%	54%	-10%
07	2023 - Spring	36%	38%	-2%	48%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	43%	-4%	55%	-16%

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	41%	-8%	44%	-11%

			ALGEBRA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	34%	47%	50%	31%

			GEOMETRY			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	39%	20%	48%	11%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	61%	-11%	66%	-16%

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 greatest need for improvement is our SWD, which shows a Federal index of 34%, which is below 41% for the current year. We see a trend of our SWD underperforming in all areas: ELA Achievement is 18%, Math Achievement is 26%, Science Achievement is 19%, and Social Studies Achievement is 36%.

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

Social studies showed the greatest decline. There are many complexity factors that contribute to this, as many students come to us from elementary school with significant existing discrepancy between their level of performance and the expectations of their grades. In addition to the existing performance deficits, many of these students did virtual learning for close to two years , which was a detriment to their growth.

New actions that will be taken to address improvement will be a strong focus on literacy across the curriculum, BEST Standards with SAVVAS text books, targeted small-group differentiated instruction in Math at an increased frequency (all students are scheduled for a 90-minute math class each day), along with supplemental instruction using Success Maker. For ELA, students with a need for improvement will be given an additional differentiation period for ELA (Intensive Reading) and will be supplemented with Success Maker instruction to improve fluency, vocabulary, and overall comprehension. These students will receive targeted small-group instruction at an increased frequency.

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.

SWD showed the greatest gap. The factors that contributed to this gap were student learning gaps in self-regulation skills, both in academics and behavior.

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

Our ELA Learning Gains (+5), ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (+12), Math Achievement (+3), Math Learning Gains (+20), Math Learning Gains of the Bottom Quartile (+22), and Science Achievement (+9) showed the most improvement in 2022.

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

SWD is an area of concern because it's our only EWS subgroup below the 41% index.

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

1. Student Self-Regulation Strategies for both Academics and Behavior
2. Instructional Routines with Small Group Instruction
3. Data-driven Decision Making
4. Teacher Efficacy as related to student improvement in Academics and Behavior.
5. Build relationships with community members (parents, business partners, community leaders)

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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 greatest need for improvement is our SWD, which shows a Federal index of 34%, which is below 41% for the current year. We see a trend of our SWD underperforming in all areas: ELA Achievement is 18%, Math Achievement is 26%, Science Achievement is 19%, and Social Studies Achievement is 36%.

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

We will increase our SWD achievement in all subject areas by 2% points.

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

ESE Support sections will have weekly walkthroughs to see efficacy of implementation. Small groups will be monitored through plans and observations. SRSD will be communicated "look for" in each classroom. Teachers and administrators will engage in collaborative data chats based on progress monitoring data, such as Success Maker, unit assessments, and standards-based formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diana Brugnone (diana.brugnone@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 increase effectiveness of our small group differentiated instruction and supplement with computer-based instruction. In addition, we will lead teachers through professional development for Self-regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) and help teachers and students develop efficacy through regular strategy instruction.

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

Our school improvement data indicates that our efforts with small-group differentiated instruction were effective in improving our math achievement, ELA learning gains, and science achievement, which was an area of focus last school year. In addition to small-group differentiated instruction, we will implement SRSD because of its documented effect size and success in the professional literature. SRSD is a highly promoted and researched approach by scholars in the field of Exceptional Student Education.

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.

Implement extended time for math instruction.

Person Responsible: Matthew Roy (matthew.roy@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 8/10/2023

Implement small-group differentiated instruction for core subject areas.

Person Responsible: Carla Bargeron (carla.bargeron@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 8/28/2023

Provide professional learning opportunities for all faculty and staff to increase teacher efficacy in helping students with self-regulated strategy development (SRSD).

Person Responsible: Carla Bargeron (carla.bargeron@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing - throughout entire school year

Create and implement calming rooms for students who are dysregulated.

Person Responsible: Christine Richards (christine.richards@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 8/3/2023

Instructional Routines with Small Group Instruction

Person Responsible: Carla Bargeron (carla.bargeron@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 8/28/2023

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

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

As per survey data and EWS data, our students are lacking self-regulation skills that will enable them to become successful rule-abiding members of society with the necessary cognitive skills to make informed decisions. These deficits have negative implications on overall achievement and will be pivotal to their success. In addition, we recognize that in order to help students develop the necessary self-regulation skills, we need to empower faculty and staff to believe in their ability to make data-informed decisions and evidence-based decisions. Teacher efficacy plays an important role in how adults on campus are responding to critical situations for student improvement and well-being.

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

Reduce Early Warning System (EWS) metrics by 5%.

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

Monthly referral moderation meetings with discipline officers.
Monthly Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III data analysis during PBiS meetings.
Data analysis meetings with teaching teams.
Attendance Committee Meetings
Restorative Practice Committee Meetings
If teacher efficacy is up, we will see learning gains on Progress Monitoring assessments.
Climate Survey data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Roy (matthew.roy@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.)

Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBiS)
CHAMPS approach to classroom management
Collaborative Problem Solving with Students (CPS) (ThinkKids.org)
Calming Rooms with Restorative Action Steps
Collective Efficacy via Professional Learning Communities
Goal Setting with Staff for Teacher Efficacy

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

There is a significant amount of research that suggests that implementing PBiS has the potential to reduce negative behaviors. In addition, proactively communicating expectations through the CHAMPS approach to classroom management has been heavily promoted by scholars at the University of Washington. Collaborative Problem Solving is a evidence-based intervention promoted by ThinkKids, which is associated with the UMass General Hospital. We aim to promote teacher efficacy with specific feedback and recognition and incentives.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 School Improvement Plan is developed with the SAC committee. All funds are approved by SAC. Department Chairs/Instructional Coaches share needs with SAC, Faculty Council, and other stakeholders. Determination is made to implement appropriate resources. IN addition to school-based safeguards, the school district's Title I office checks all purchases for compliance and equitable allocation of resources. Need for resources is also determined by data-driven decision making at the classroom, school, and district level.

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

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

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?

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?

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

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.

This SIP is disseminated to stakeholders via SAC meetings, school website, school social media, Sklyert Phone calls, and Title I parent meetings.

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))

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through SAC meetings, community partnerships with the St. Lucie County Library, Parent Teacher Organization, and various parent nights throughout the school year. In addition, we also have a Skyward Parent Portal, which allows students access to their child's grades, schedule, and contact information for teachers. For the 2023-2024 school year, the school is in the process of developing an application which will be located in the App Store and Android Store. The application developer aims to have the app available by late October or early November.

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))

To strengthen the academic program, the school strives to focus on embedding small group instruction into each classroom, develop instruction through a weekly PLC process, and use quality assessments to drive instructional decisions. To increase the amount and quality of learning time, all students receive a

block of math instruction daily, which doubles the amount of instructional time that all students receive in quality math instruction. In addition, the school makes uses of evidence-based instructional routines provided by the school district that heavily encourage the use of the Gradual Release of Instruction model. For accelerated curriculum, students' state assessment scores are used to determine course placement. For example, all students who are a Level 4 or higher in Math are placed in high-school-level math classes.

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))

This plan is developed in coordination and integration with Title I, Title III and Migrant programs.

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))

We have two school counselors who each serve half of the school's population. We also have a social worker who meets with students individually and conducts small-group sessions with identified students. We have a drug prevention counselor on campus who completes an 8-week program with referred students, and we also have a SAP counselor who works with select students. In addition to our team of mental health professionals, we also have about 1% of our student population who are part of our iSucceed Mentoring program who receive one-on-one mentorship approximately once each week for the purpose of developing cognitive and social flexibility.

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))

All students who are proficient in math at the end of 7th grade are scheduled in Algebra I, which is a high school math class. Students who participate in Algebra I in middle school will be more likely to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school.

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).

As a school, we focus on restorative practices to positively shape desired behaviors. Each of our teaching teams has a restorative calming room where students can reflect and focus on social skills development. In addition, we offer social skills lessons to students who do not meet beahvioral expectations with redirection. As far as the implementation of a tiered model, our behavior system focuses on three tiers of behavior intervention. We have Tier 1 universal instruction on behavior expectations for all students. We use CHAMPS, PBiS, and Single School Culture scripts to help students understand expectations. For Tier 2, students who are not meeting Tier 1 expectations become eligible for mentoring or check-in/check-out. For Tier 3, we develop personalized behavior plans and use the Problem-solving Team process to analyze functions of behavior and determine antecedent interventions

specifically to address functions of behavior for individual students. In addition, we follow a progressive discipline matrix in alignment with the school district's code of conduct.

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))

Teachers engage in job-embedded professional learning through professional learning communities (PLCs). Each of the PLCs has a trained facilitator to guide the PLC team through the process of analyzing student learning data, making decisions based on the data, and planning instruction to the meet the needs of students. To recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects, we put a strong emphasis on a PLC model to retain and recruit effective teachers. Teachers enjoy working in a community of support.

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))

NA