Oak Hammock K 8 School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Oak Hammock K 8 School

1251 SW CALIFORNIA BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

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

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.

Teachers will design authentic and satisfying work that will challenge and engage every child, equipping each to become a productive member of a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Oak Hammock K-8 School will be a vibrant learning environment that nurtures each student to continuously improve academic performance. The students will learn to become contributing citizens in a school community that is respectful, responsible, safe, and positive. The school will foster a love of teaching and learning for students to carry through to graduation, so they may reach their full potential in life.

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
Lee, Jaclyn	Principal	
McClendon-Morgan, Danita	Assistant Principal	
Pierce, David	Assistant Principal	
Ricks, Barbara	Assistant Principal	
Martin, Amber	Other	

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 leadership team includes school leaders, as well as teachers who demonstrate highly effective skills and knowledge in their content area. The SIP is developed by the school leadership team and provides opportunities for collaboration and input from all stakeholders. Our School Advisory Council will review and provide feedback on the SIP before it is submitted for final approval.

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))

Student achievement data is regularly monitored. This includes local and state assessments. After each state progress monitoring assessment, the SIP goals will be reviewed and revised as needed.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	73%
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) 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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	6	40	34	40	40	39	63	82	81	425
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	8	20	29	45	67	68	242
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	14	9	14	3	2	0	15	19	76
Course failure in Math	0	20	13	32	3	0	0	33	21	122
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	46	18	6	56	43	87	77	88	421
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	62	23	47	49	52	114	37	78	462
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	42	44	57	68	64	85	77	107	551

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	2	64	32	56	73	68	126	110	117	648

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	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	13
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	44	48	24	39	40	29	67	77	102	470
One or more suspensions	4	2	12	21	26	32	58	74	82	311
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	2	1	17	10	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	2	0	58	17	1	82
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	53	45	61	68	86	313
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	60	69	70	60	99	86	444
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	51	49	136	236

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	4	2	1	0	0	1	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	44	48	24	39	40	29	67	77	102	470
One or more suspensions	4	2	12	21	26	32	58	74	82	311
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	2	1	17	10	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	2	0	58	17	1	82
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	53	45	61	68	86	313
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	60	69	70	60	99	86	444
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	64	32	56	73	68	126	110	117	648

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	4	2	1	0	0	1	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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*	44	50	53	42	53	55	48		
ELA Learning Gains				45			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			47		
Math Achievement*	43	51	55	40	41	42	39		
Math Learning Gains				49			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			33		
Science Achievement*	37	52	52	40	50	54	38		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	71	68	74	55	59	58		
Middle School Acceleration	62	75	70	74	50	51	50		
Graduation Rate		90	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		69	53		74	70			
ELP Progress	47	44	55	40	78	70	49		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	353
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
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	2
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	44			
BLK	49			
HSP	50			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	49			

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	52			
BLK	47			
HSP	51			

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%
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	48			

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	44			43			37	71	62			47
SWD	18			20			11	46			6	36
ELL	37			35			31	63			6	47
AMI												
ASN	47			41							2	
BLK	42			37			28	74	59		7	47
HSP	43			43			38	66	63		7	47
MUL	45			41			22	83			4	
PAC												
WHT	44			52			48	71	70		6	
FRL	41			40			34	74	59		7	48

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	42	45	36	40	49	50	40	74	74			40
SWD	14	28	25	19	36	38	18	45				
ELL	31	45	35	31	39	33	35	70	58			40
AMI												
ASN	60	36		43	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
BLK	32	40	38	31	45	48	27	61	80			64
HSP	46	50	35	42	50	51	44	81	75			32
MUL	38	51	67	37	68	59	40	77				
PAC												
WHT	47	43	27	47	47	50	47	75	73			
FRL	40	45	37	38	50	50	31	72	75			40

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	48	50	47	39	37	33	38	58	50			49
SWD	18	45	51	20	46	45	28	30				
ELL	34	49	50	30	41	38	11	45				49
AMI												
ASN	50	50		53	9		60					
BLK	38	45	39	24	30	29	20	45	26			45
HSP	52	55	54	44	41	35	42	57	54			51
MUL	53	54	55	38	41		48		50			
PAC												
WHT	51	46	47	47	39	38	46	64	64			
FRL	44	51	50	35	34	35	33	55	47			52

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	37%	46%	-9%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	42%	43%	-1%	47%	-5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	37%	43%	-6%	47%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	52%	-9%	58%	-15%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	42%	4%	47%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	42%	-1%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	68%	48%	20%	54%	14%
07	2023 - Spring	29%	38%	-9%	48%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	52%	-14%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	56%	-13%	61%	-18%
08	2023 - Spring	31%	43%	-12%	55%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	28%	48%	-20%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	32%	41%	-9%	44%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	47%	-12%	51%	-16%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	34%	31%	50%	15%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	39%	53%	48%	44%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	66%	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.

Science Achievement was at the lowest performance (36%). Students gaps in foundational knowledge gained prior to and between tested grade levels contributed to low performance. Students with Disabilities had a federal index of 28%.

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

Science Achievement declined by 4% from the prior year. Fifth grade Science showed an increase, while Eighth Grade Science declined by 8%. A contributing factor is that students in K-5 have a greater exposure to Science informational text in ELA, while students in 6-8 are exposed less frequently to Science based informational text in ELA. This also correlates to a drop in ELA proficiency for the 8th grade cohort, dropping from 45% to 39% proficiency. Student engagement and instructional strategies to increase student engagement and processing were also a contributing factor to overall achievement.

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.

Science Achievement had the greatest gap of 13% when compared to the state average. A contributing factor is student disengagement and lack of background knowledge.

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

Math achievement showed the most improvement with an 8% increase. The actions taken were that we added a Math Coach position and implemented a new Math curriculum. A stronger focus on SLPS Math Routines was also in place. Supplemental Math resources, as well as a stronger focus on Math after-school tutoring were implemented.

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

1. Students with Absences of 10% or more
2. Students with a Level 1 on ELA and Math

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

1. Math Achievement
2. MS Acceleration
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA Achievement
5. Social Studies 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 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.

Student attendance is a critical component for student achievement. Too many absences can affect the individual student's academic performance, as well as can be disruptive to the learning environment for the classroom.

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

Decrease the number of students who have 10% or more absences.
15-19 Absences will decrease to 12% (-2.51%)
20-24 Absences will decrease to 8% (-1.77%)
25+ Absences will decrease to 8% (-2.80%)

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

Identified students from last school year will be monitored weekly. Any new students who are reaching 10% for this school year will be added to the weekly monitoring group.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Ricks (barbara.ricks@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.)

A tiered intervention for attendance will be used to include SLPS Attendance Campaign, parent communication/conferencing, and student incentives for attendance. SLPS iSucceed plan will also support the child and our families who struggle with student attendance. Finally, purposeful planning for student engagement will positively impact student attendance.

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

Teaching about good attendance encourages families to see the connection between student attendance and academic success. Positive recognition for student attendance supports a school culture of attendance.

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 3 - Promising 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 school-wide attendance letter at Open House.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August, 2023.

Implement SLPS attendance initiative.

Person Responsible: Barbara Ricks (barbara.ricks@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August, 2023.

iSucceed student plans for identified students.

Person Responsible: Barbara Ricks (barbara.ricks@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September, 2023.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Students who are engaged in learning are active participants that take ownership of the content and skills and develop deeper understanding. Classroom walk-through data correlated with student performance data showing a need for increased planning for student engagement.

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

ELA Achievement will increase to 50% (+4%)
Math Achievement will increase to 52% (+4%)
Social Studies Achievement will increase to 75% (+4%)
Science Achievement will increase to 40% (+4%)
MS Acceleration will increase to 75% (+4%)
SWD federal index will increase to 41% (+13%)

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

Weekly walk-through data will be collected using the Osprey Engagement SOAR form. Student performance on local and state assessments will be monitored throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@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.)

Teacher feedback and professional learning will be provided on student engagement, student collaboration, and assessing student understanding. After weekly walk-throughs, teachers will receive feedback, as well as professional learning, aligned to student engagement, student collaboration, and assessing student understanding.

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

Based on trends observed in prior year and evaluation of student data, there is a need to increase student engagement and achievement through instructional strategies.
Based on SWD federal index, there is a need to focus on differentiated instruction coupled with student engagement to increase the achievement for students with disabilities.

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 professional learning in student engagement strategies, to include planning for student engagement and student collaboration.

Person Responsible: Amber Martin (amber.martin@stlucieschools.org)

By When: October, 2023.

Provide actionable feedback to teachers related to student engagement in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August, 2023.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Classroom instruction must align with the Florida State Benchmarks in order for students to achieve grade
level proficiency. Teachers are still in the developing phase of understanding and implementing newly
developed benchmarks within the newly adopted resources.

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

ELA Achievement will increase to 50% (+4%)
Math Achievement will increase to 52% (+4%)
Social Studies Achievement will increase to 75% (+4%)
Science Achievement will increase to 40% (+4%)
MS Acceleration will increase to 75% (+4%)
SWD federal index will increase to 41% (+13%)

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

Literacy and Math coaches, as well as administration will participate in CLP sessions. Classroom
walkthrough data and assessment data will also monitored for implementation of instruction planned for in
CLPS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@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.)

Collaborative Learning and Planning is an investment in peer-to-peer professional learning. It is an
opportunity for teachers to teach and learn from one another for the pedagogical effectiveness as they
work toward student achievement. Collaborative planning for differentiated instruction meets the needs of
students with disabilities.

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

Through the CLP process, teachers collaborate on identifying learning targets, planning for instruction,
analyzing student work/formative assessments, and differentiation to meet the needs of all students.
Differentiated instruction allows teachers to meet the needs of all students and especially students with
disabilities to improve learning outcomes.

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.

Establish a school-wide collaborative learning and planning schedule to include half-day planning and before/after school.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August, 2023.

Implement SLPS Math and Literacy routines within the classroom.

Person Responsible: Amber Martin (amber.martin@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September, 2023.

Provide actionable feedback to teachers regarding CLP and classroom observation.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August, 2023.

Provide ongoing professional learning on the benchmarks, curriculum resources, and curriculum routines.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Lee (jaclyn.lee@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 2023

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 is reviewed continuously to determine the student achievement needs of our school. Based on the prior year's data, our leadership team reviews our Title 1 budget to ensure that the funding provides the resources based on our student achievement needs. Our resources also support our areas of focus and student achievement goals.

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

Word recognition skills planning to include all MTSS tiers to increase proficiency in instructional practice and student achievement in Reading/ELA.

Collaborative learning and planning cycle to increase proficiency in instructional practice, student engagement and student achievement in Reading/ELA.

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

Language comprehension skills planning to include all MTSS tiers to increase proficiency in instructional practice and student achievement in Reading/ELA.

Collaborative learning and planning cycle to increase proficiency in instructional practice, student engagement and student achievement in 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

2023 Star PM3 Data
% of Students in Kindergarten Scoring Above 40th Percentile: 55%
% of Students in 1st Grade Scoring Above 40th Percentile: 48%
% of Students in 2nd Grade Scoring Above 40th Percentile: 54%

Grade 1 will increase to 51% of students scoring above 40th percentile.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

2023 FAST PM3 Data
Grade 3: 41%
Grade 4: 43%
Grade 5: 37%

Grades 3, 4, and 5 will increase to 51% proficiency in ELA/Reading.

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.

K-2 progress monitoring will occur three times a year through Star Assessment.
Grades 3-5 progress monitoring will occur after each instructional unit in ELA. FAST progress monitoring will occur three times a year.

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

Lee, Jaclyn, jaclyn.lee@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?

The following programs will be used to increase word recognition, automaticity in first grade: Heggerty for Phonological Awareness, Benchmark Advance Phonics Skill Bags for decoding, and Benchmark Advance High Frequency Words daily lessons for sight word recognition.

To increase students strategic use of language comprehension skills in grades 3-5, the Benchmark Advance units of instruction will focus upon building background knowledge, vocabulary, language structures, verbal reasoning, and literacy knowledge.

Teacher read alouds will be used to model language comprehension and word recognition to produce fluent skilled reading.

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?

All of the identified programs support the components of the Science of Reading to enhance reading comprehension through ample strategic instruction that focuses on word recognition and language 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
Literacy leadership team will provide the professional learning, support in data analysis and resource alignment to increase teacher knowledge and implementation.	Martin, Amber, amber.martin@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.

The SIP presentation with updates will be ongoing throughout the year at various parent involvement events, including our SAC, PTO, and Title 1 parental involvement events. Our SIP will made available on our school website at https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/oak/.

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))

Parents and families will be invited to parental involvement activities throughout the year. During these events, parents will be provided resources and their child's academic progress, which can allow parents to better support their child at home. Our PFEP will made available on our school website at https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/oak/.

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 academic programs will be strengthened through our areas of focus: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement and Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction.

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 Title 1 budget is aligned to our School Improvement Plan.

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))

The school follows SLPS plan to ensure counseling and mentoring services occur to support students outside 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))

Academic and career planning will occur within the Xello program which will provide students with personalized academic and career plans.

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).

Through MTSS, tiered levels of behavior support are provided to students, including the use of PBIS, CHAMPS, and classroom/team management plans. Additionally, our iSucceed student plans provide students with clearly defined behavioral goals, strategies, and incentives.

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))

Professional learning is ongoing for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel and is aligned to our focus areas of instructional practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction and instructional practice specifically relating to Student Engagement. New teachers participate in SLPS new teacher program and are placed with a mentor teacher.

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))

Incoming Kindergarten students and their families participate in a Kindergarten transition camp to support students in their transition. Additionally, resources are provided to our incoming Kindergarten students that can be used in the home prior to beginning Kindergarten.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No