

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Chester A. Moore Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Chester A. Moore Elementary School

827 N 29TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

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

## 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.**

Chester A. Moore Elementary is a positive learning environment where the whole child is engaged and inspired by dedicated stakeholders who work together to create and empower life-long learners.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Chester A. Moore Elementary is the school where excellence is believed and achieved by all.

### 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
Jackson, Thelma	Principal	
Berggren, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Davis, Tammy	Assistant Principal	

**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.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is utilized to involve all stakeholders in developing and overseeing the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The majority of SAC membership includes families, business, and community partners.

**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))

All instructional staff participate in regular monitoring of SIP goals during weekly data Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) meetings. During Data CLPs, student and subgroup performance in ELA, math, science, and writing assessments (weekly, unit, district, and state) are reviewed and used to guide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.

### Demographic Data

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	98%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	97%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: D
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	4	26	30	23	23	22	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	8	3	6	0	0	0	25
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	15	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	4	18	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	5	13	16	5	30	28	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	5	20	22	26	19	27	0	0	0	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	19	26	27	34	31	0	0	0	142

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	5	28	37	35	34	35	0	0	0	174

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	5	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	24	31	38	31	23	29	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	2	8	6	12	8	15	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	32	35	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	32	25	31	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	7	5	3	9	0	0	0	32

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	1	12	6	24	28	38	0	0	0	109

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	0	0	

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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



Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	24	31	38	31	23	29	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	2	8	6	12	8	15	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	32	35	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	32	25	31	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	7	5	3	9	0	0	0	32

**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	1	12	6	24	28	38	0	0	0	109

**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	0	0	

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	50	53	28	53	55	20		
ELA Learning Gains				47			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			47		
Math Achievement*	56	51	55	42	41	42	34		
Math Learning Gains				57			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			25		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	26	52	52	25	50	54	25		
Social Studies Achievement*		71	68		55	59			
Middle School Acceleration		75	70		50	51			
Graduation Rate		90	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		69	53		74	70			
ELP Progress	70	44	55	41	78	70	37		

\* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	219
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	18	Yes	4	4
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	4	
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	44			

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	20	Yes	3	3
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	40	Yes	3	

**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	33			56			26					70
SWD	12			24			18				4	
ELL	40			63			13				5	70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			52			25				4	
HSP	42			67			25				5	72
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34			56			26				5	70

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	28	47	44	42	57	49	25					41
SWD	5	18	25	11	36	38	10					
ELL	37	54		58	60		31					40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	44	44	36	55	47	24					45
HSP	36	51		57	58		28					40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	27	46	44	40	57	49	23					36

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	20	40	47	34	23	25	25					37
SWD	11	33		18	17	10	7					
ELL	23	43		39	27		26					37

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	41	45	30	20	23	22					38
HSP	24	36		44	30		37					36
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	20	42	53	33	23	27	27					33

**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	35%	46%	-11%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	42%	-11%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	56%	-7%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	23%	47%	-24%	51%	-28%

### 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.**

Based on 2023 PM3 data, science showed the lowest performance at 25% proficiency. This data point has remained stagnant for three consecutive years. Potentially contributing factors include: the timing and administration of the assessment which was taken between ELA and math and also paper-based versus computer-based. Additionally, an instructional focus was placed on ELA and math due to those assessments being new in 2023.

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

No schoolwide data points declined in 2022-2023.

**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.**

2022-2023 ELA achievement with the greatest gaps when compared to the state include: 5th grade science (-26%), Grades 3-5 ELA (-20%), and 4th grade math (-12%). Contributing factors include historically critically low ELA achievement beginning in 2020 at 20% proficiency that has improved to 34% in 2023. Additionally, low student deficits in reading contribute to deficits in science.

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

2023 3rd grade math achievement demonstrated the greatest improvement exceeding the state average by 4%. Fidelity of implementation of core curriculum, strategic content-based Collaborative Learning and Planning, data-driven Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction, and extended learning opportunities utilizing in-school and after school tutoring.

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

The major area of concern based on EWS data is reading achievement which also impacts science achievement.

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

#1 Maintaining Grades 3-5 Math Achievement

#2 Improving ELA K-5 Achievement

#3 Increasing Grade 5 Science Achievement

#### Area of Focus

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

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

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Teacher recruitment and retention is an area of focus due to the current national teacher shortage and turnover specifically at high-poverty schools. Compared to other green zone or poverty schools in the district, Chester A. Moore Elementary has retained teachers having to hire only two teachers in the past two years.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Chester A. Moore Elementary will retain 90% of its current teaching staff.

### Monitoring:

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

Staff surveys and retention rates will be utilized to monitor the number of teachers remaining for three or more years at Chester A. Moore Elementary.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thelma Jackson (thelma.jackson@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.)

1. Provide incentive bonuses through district resources and federal grant programs. (Select positions)
2. Create and maintain a positive school culture whereby teachers are acknowledged and rewarded for their contributions.
3. Ensure all teachers are provided access to administrative, resource, coaching, district Office of Teaching and Learning, and School Renewal supports.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

<https://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Hillary204290320-20Research20Update20320Dec17.pdf>

1. Incentive pay/bonuses will be utilized to recruit teachers to work at Chester A. Moore Elementary.
2. Building and maintaining a positive school culture is crucial to the make-up of the school and necessary for new and returning teachers to feel welcomed, valued and appreciated to provide instruction for students.
3. Collegiality and collaboration are vital to ensuring both new and veteran teachers have the supports and tools to navigate the challenges of the profession.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Utilize grant funds to provide incentives to teachers with effective and highly effective VAM scores who remain at Chester A. Moore Elementary.
2. Provide opportunities for teachers to earn pay for participating in collaborative planning outside of their normal duty day (evenings and weekends).
3. Hire a K-2 Reading Coach, a 3-5 Reading Coach, and a Math/Science Coach to support CLPs and instructional needs.
4. Reinstate the Sunshine Committee to ensure celebrations and social gatherings are implemented.
5. Administration will maintain an 'open door' policy and high vigilance throughout the school and within classrooms.

**Person Responsible:** Thelma Jackson (thelma.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

**By When:** June 1, 2024



## #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

### 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.

The Federal Index indicates three subgroups do not meet proficiency requirements: Students with Disabilities, Black/African-American, and Economically Disadvantaged. These subgroups will be targeted due to less than 41% of students in these subgroups meeting proficiency requirements.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Student achievement will improve as follows: Students with Disabilities from 20% to 41%, Black/African-American students from 40% to 41%, and Economically Disadvantaged from 40% to 41%.

### Monitoring:

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

1. Daily checks for understanding, district, and state assessments.
2. Progress monitoring of Tier 2 and Tier 3 individual and small group interventions.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thelma Jackson (thelma.jackson@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.)

1. Extended learning day providing MTSS instruction in reading.
2. Ongoing professional learning ensuring fidelity of implementation of core and supplemental curriculum.
3. Utilization of Tier 2 and Tier 3 supplemental instructional resources including: Acaletics math, Magnetic Reading, Penda Learning for science, Really Great Reading Phonics, and Top Score Writing.
4. Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLPs) engaging all instructional and support staff in disaggregating data to develop data-driven individualized and small group instruction.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research (<https://www.teacherready.org/increase-student-achievement/>) indicates the following interventions impact subgroup performance:

1. Standards-aligned instruction.
2. Strategic alignment of resources and staff.
3. Tiered layers of instructional support and interventions.
4. Formative assessments.
5. Data chats providing students with consistent feedback for improvement.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Ensure support facilitation teachers, paraprofessionals, volunteers, mentors, and tutors are scheduled to provide targeted instruction during small group instructional times to provide reteaching and scaffolding.
2. Support staff will attend at least one grade level CLP to review data, understand B.E.S.T. standards, process core and supplemental curriculum, and strategize ways to support instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Thelma Jackson (thelma.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

**By When:** June 1, 2024

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

Instructional practice in science is identified as an area of focus due to this data point remaining stagnant for three consecutive years. Although reading achievement has 15 points since 2021, science achievement has not improved.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Student achievement on the Grade 5 Florida Statewide Science Assessment will improve from 25% proficiency to 40% proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Daily checks for understanding, district, and state assessments.
2. Progress monitoring of Tier 2 and Tier 3 individual and small group interventions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Thelma Jackson (thelma.jackson@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.)

1. Extended learning day providing MTSS instruction in reading.
2. Ongoing professional learning ensuring fidelity of implementation of core and supplemental curriculum.
3. Utilization of Tier 2 and Tier 3 supplemental instructional resources including: Acaletics math, Magnetic Reading, Penda Learning for science, Really Great Reading Phonics, and Top Score Writing.
4. Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLPs) engaging all instructional and support staff in disaggregating data to develop data-driven individualized and small group instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research (<https://www.teacherready.org/increase-student-achievement/>) indicates the following interventions impact subgroup performance:

1. Standards-aligned instruction.
2. Strategic alignment of resources and staff.
3. Tiered layers of instructional support and interventions.
4. Formative assessments.
5. Data chats providing students with consistent feedback for improvement.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Ensure support facilitation teachers, paraprofessionals, volunteers, mentors, and tutors are scheduled to provide targeted instruction during small group instructional times to provide reteaching and scaffolding.
2. Support staff will attend at least one grade level CLP to review data, understand B.E.S.T. standards, process core and supplemental curriculum, and strategize ways to support instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Thelma Jackson (thelma.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

**By When:** June 1, 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.

Instructional practice relating to ELA is an area of focus due to the historically low performance of ELA student achievement. A strategic focus on ELA teaching and learning will continue the trajectory of growth the school is currently experiencing resulting in a seven point increase in ELA student achievement in 2022 and an eight point increase in 2023.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Student achievement in English Language Arts (ELA) will improve from 35% to 45% proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Daily checks for understanding, district, and state assessments.
2. Progress monitoring of Tier 2 and Tier 3 individual and small group interventions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Thelma Jackson (thelma.jackson@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.)

1. Extended learning day providing MTSS instruction in reading.
2. Ongoing professional learning ensuring fidelity of implementation of core and supplemental curriculum.
3. Utilization of Tier 2 and Tier 3 supplemental instructional resources including: Acaletics math, Magnetic Reading, Penda Learning for science, Really Great Reading Phonics, and Top Score Writing.
4. Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLPs) engaging all instructional and support staff in disaggregating data to develop data-driven individualized and small group instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research (<https://www.teacherready.org/increase-student-achievement/>) indicates the following interventions impact subgroup performance:

1. Standards-aligned instruction.
2. Strategic alignment of resources and staff.
3. Tiered layers of instructional support and interventions.
4. Formative assessments.
5. Data chats providing students with consistent feedback for improvement.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Ensure support facilitation teachers, paraprofessionals, volunteers, mentors, and tutors are scheduled to provide targeted instruction during small group instructional times to provide reteaching and scaffolding.
2. Support staff will attend at least one grade level CLP to review data, understand B.E.S.T. standards, process core and supplemental curriculum, and strategize ways to support instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Thelma Jackson (thelma.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

**By When:** June 1, 2024

### **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).

Student data has been reviewed in conjunction with the School Advisory Council to identify areas of focus and resources needed. Specifically, Title I funds are being used to fund two literacy coaches and supplemental materials. The school also receives support from district staff including: the district Administrator on Special Assignment overseeing grants, the Office of Teaching and Learning which approves and provides supplemental resources, the Federal and Special Programs Manager for Title 1 to plan budgets, and the Coordinator for Title 1 to plan parent involvement events and resources.

### **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**

71% of Grade 1 and 61% of Grade 2 students are scoring below Level 3. Grades K-2 teachers will target instruction for students needing emergent literacy skills to increase student mastery of on grade level phonics skills as measured by the STAR Reading statewide assessment.

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

62% of Grade 4 and 67% of Grade 5 students are scoring below Level 3. Grades 3-5 teachers will provide foundational reading skills instruction targeting decoding and encoding skills to reduce by 50% the number of students scoring below Level 3 on the FAST ELA Reading statewide 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

90% of K-2 students will master grade level phonics including letter names, sounds and CVC words resulting in 50% of grades K, 1, and 2 students scoring Level 3 or above on the STAR Reading statewide assessment.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The number of students in grades 3-5 identified with phonics and vocabulary deficits will decrease resulting in 50% of Grades 3, 4, and 5 students scoring Level 3 or above on the FAST ELA Reading statewide assessment.

### 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.

i-Ready Reading Diagnostics Instructional Profile Groupings 1 and 2, PM1 and PM2 ELA Reading data will be progress monitored.

#### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jackson, Thelma, [thelma.jackson@stlucieschools.org](mailto:thelma.jackson@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?

1. The Literacy Leadership Team (Administrators, Reading Coaches) will complete weekly classroom walkthroughs utilizing the School Leader’s Literacy Walkthrough Tool to provide feedback and supports to improve instruction.
2. Ensure effective implementation of the Benchmark Advance core ELA curriculum.
3. Utilize CLPs to plan Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 reading instruction.
4. Implement supplemental reading curriculum for differentiated instruction that includes: Really Great Reading phonics systems in grades K-2 and Magnetic Reading.
5. Schedule Interventionist and ESE Support Facilitation teachers to provide supplemental reading instruction to Tier 3 students.
6. Reading coaches will monitor, support, and enhance classroom instruction through CLPs and coaching cycles.
7. Collaborate with the Regional Literacy Director to provide professional development.

**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?

Research outlined by What Works Clearinghouse <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/3> supports the use of universal screeners and progress monitoring such as Renaissance STAR, FAST, and i-Ready Reading Diagnostics to target small group and individualized instruction in foundational reading skills and comprehension.

**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
<p>Literacy Leadership: The Literacy Leadership Team will implement a weekly classroom walkthrough schedule utilizing the Literacy Walkthrough Tool to provide feedback and targeted supports.</p>	<p>Jackson, Thelma, thelma.jackson@stlucieschools.org</p>
<p>Assessment: ELA teachers will utilize daily, weekly, and unit assessments to monitor student progress toward mastery of standards. Weekly data CLPs will be utilized to review data to make instructional shifts.</p>	<p>Jackson, Thelma, thelma.jackson@stlucieschools.org</p>

## 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.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is posted on the school website at: <https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/cam/>

During monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, the SIP, School Parent Compact, and Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) are reviewed for stakeholder input. Stakeholders may provide verbal feedback or written feedback during SAC meetings. The principal also encourages stakeholder input via telephone and email.

**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 Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is posted on the school website at: <https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/cam/>. Positive relationships are established with all stakeholders are established through daily accessibility to the principal and school staff via telephone, email, scheduled and unscheduled conferences. The PFEP documents SAC meetings and a variety of PFEP activities to provide stakeholders access to teaching and learning activities, student achievement data, cultural events, and student performances. The front office staff utilizes the Explorer Express Form to formally document complaints which are addressed by the principal within 24 hours.

**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 four areas of focused listed in Part II of the SIP will be utilized to improve and accelerate math, reading, science, and subgroup performance.

**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))**

NA