Windmill Point Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

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

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.

Windmill Point Elementary promises to nurture a positive school culture and to ensure academic excellence by preparing students for college and career readiness through the fostering of self-confidence, instillation of responsibility, and development of leadership skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Upon entering Windmill Point Elementary, you are met with a warm and inviting environment. When you enter our school, you are welcomed by faculty and staff members. As you walk the halls, you hear the chatter of children excitedly discussing the day's assignments. Glancing around, you notice authentic work that students have chosen to display. It is apparent that students feel secure and comfortable at Windmill Point.

As you continue through Windmill Point, you observe that everyone in the school believes it is important to discover what motivates children. Administration, faculty, and staff work collaboratively to design engaging work for students. Teachers are guided by their grade level scope and sequence and have a clear understanding of what students should know and be able to do. They use data from a variety of assessments, including engagement surveys, to guide instruction for each individual child. Faculty and staff strive to meet high expectations. They are lifelong learners and model this behavior for students. Teachers eagerly implement innovative ideas in their classroom and often share results with colleagues, parents, and community members.

Continuing your journey through our school, you see evidence of parent and community involvement. At Windmill Point Elementary, these citizens serve as partners in educating children. The community volunteers are valuable resources that are utilized to provide rich and authentic learning experiences for children. Administrators, teachers, and staff create opportunities for parental and community involvement to promote student achievement. All of the Windmill Point family is involved in the school decision making process, focusing on every aspect of the child's education.

Windmill Point Elementary is a unique school where everyone works together and supports one another. The ultimate goal is the continuous improvement of students, teachers, staff, and community partners as an integral part of our students' education.

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
Lamb, Brie	Principal	
Jackson, LaKeitha	Assistant Principal	
Reals, Leah	Assistant Principal	
Godfrey, Sharonia	Administrative Support	
Knab, Heather	Reading Coach	
Kline, Courtney	Instructional Coach	
Gedke, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	
Ackenbrack, Cara-Ann	Teacher, K-12	
Caballero, Christine	School Counselor	
Hsu, Kristen	School Counselor	
Mihajlovski, Virginia	Teacher, ESE	

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.

Throughout the school year, Windmill Point reviews the SIP within our monthly staff meetings, SAC/PTO meetings and Title I nights. Each month we review our goals set forth and how we are progressing in meeting them. When we review the goals with community stakeholders, parents, and staff there is discussion of what tools we are using to implement and monitor our outcomes to reach those goals.

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))

Each week grade groups meet to review data and student outcomes. During the data chats each grade group will discuss English Language Arts and Math assessments that are put out by our school district. Teams will also provide input and feedback based on progress monitoring tools that are identified in weekly Collaborative Learning and Planning. Grade groups will collaborate during plannings on how they will identify if students have shown mastery in the understanding of the standard and what strategies/ interventions will be used to support reteaching in small groups if necessary.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	72%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	20	50	52	43	38	38	0	0	0	241
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	0	3	10	0	0	0	21
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	20	45	21	0	1	0	0	0	88
Course failure in Math	1	15	34	36	4	1	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	1	42	9	8	42	42	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	51	30	40	40	42	0	0	0	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	41	52	61	62	54	0	0	0	279
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	60	57	55	53	52	0	0	0	282

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	2	1	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	56	51	42	45	38	48	0	0	0	280
One or more suspensions	2	4	0	4	12	6	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	27	6	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	40	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	32	54	0	0	0	121
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	12	16	9	0	0	0	0	46

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	7	2	34	33	44	0	0	0	121

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	56	51	42	45	38	48	0	0	0	280
One or more suspensions	2	4	0	4	12	6	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	27	6	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	40	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	32	54	0	0	0	121
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	12	16	9	0	0	0	0	46

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	7	2	34	33	44	0	0	0	121

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	44	53	53	46	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				61			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			74		
Math Achievement*	47	52	59	54	43	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				62			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	49	49	54	42	50	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	58	59	58			36		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	249
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	42			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	46			

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	44			
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	51			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	52			

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	48			47			49					59
SWD	20			30			7				5	70
ELL	28			36			40				5	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			44			40				5	63
HSP	38			45			36				5	56
MUL	67			50							3	
PAC												
WHT	57			54			70				4	
FRL	43			45			41				5	57

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	53	61	52	54	62	55	42					58
SWD	21	50	61	31	61	72	15					
ELL	36	46	39	44	58	56	34					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	67	65	40	67	69	24					62
HSP	43	54	52	50	60	54	36					55
MUL	87	76		87	71							
PAC												
WHT	67	60	33	70	59	33	56					
FRL	46	60	54	49	60	55	35					60

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	53	63	74	49	37	41	40					36
SWD	9	45	67	23	30	43	0					
ELL	35	57	64	44	35		20					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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	63		31	25		28					33
HSP	44	51	58	50	36	30	35					36
MUL	79			67								
PAC												
WHT	64	69	92	62	50	54	51					
FRL	49	58	77	45	32	35	36					29

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	49%	46%	3%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	42%	0%	50%	-8%

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	56%	-7%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	55%	-9%

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	51%	-4%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement (49%). The contributing factor is the lack of ELA proficiency in 5th grade (50%).

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was English Language Arts Achievement which was 53% (2022) to 50% (2023). The factors that attributed to the decline include changing from paper based to computer based testing, teaching to the intent and rigor of the standard, and implementation of small group instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap is Math Achievement at 52% for Windmill Point Elementary and the state average is 58%. The factors that contributed to this gap and trend include a decline in students who were proficient in grade four and grade five.

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

All data components decline (even minimally), so there is not a "most improved" data component.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data, an area of concern is the number of students (241) who were absent 10% or more days.

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

1. Improve English Language Arts Achievement
2. Improve Math Achievement
3. Improve Learning Gains in Math

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

According to state assessment in both 2021 and 2022, 53% of students were proficient in ELA which decreased in 2023 to 50% (-3%).

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

By June 2024, students will increase ELA Achievement by 5%, earning 55% proficiency, on the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

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

This area of focus will be monitored using iReady, state Progress Monitoring, and district tests.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@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.)

The evidence-based strategy to being implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning), Differentiated Instruction, and coaching and feedback. Additionally using Benchmark Advance for whole group and small group instruction and LLI for tiered intervention.

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

Benchmark Advance is our peer-reviewed adopted text book materials for ELA instruction which creates consistency between classrooms and grade levels. Additionally, LLI is a researched based intervention used to provided targeted instruction. Also, coaching will be provided during modeling and CLPs as part of our literacy plan, and our Reading Interventionist will provide tier interventions and monitor all students ELA progress.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for whole group and small group.

Person Responsible: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 6/2024

Provide school-based coaching and support in Collaborative Learning and Planning, model for teachers, and provide ELA professional development.

Person Responsible: Heather Knab (heather.knab@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 6/2024

Common grade level CLP times for all teachers including ESE, additional CLP meetings after school hours, and ELA professional development.

Person Responsible: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 8/2023

Monitor implementation and effectiveness tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible: Cara-Ann Ackenbrack (cara-ann.ackenbrack@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 6/2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.
According to the state assessment in 2021, our Achievement Level was 50% and our Achievement Level in 2022 was 54%; however, in 2023, our Achievement Level was 52% (-2%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
By June 2024, students will increase Math Achievement by 8%, earning 60% proficiency, on the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
This area of focus will be monitored using iReady, state Progress Monitoring, and district tests.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@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.)
The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create rigorous, standards based instruction, review data (Quality Instruction), create differentiated Instruction, and to deep the knowledge of standards and resources with teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
The rational for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers (both general education and ESE teachers) to create common lesson plans that are standards based using appropriate resources. Additionally, to implement intervention strategies, during small group/differentiated instruction, to meet students' needs.
Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence
Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No
Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.
Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for whole group and small group.
Person Responsible: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)
By When: 6/2024
Provide school-based coaching and support in Collaborative Learning and Planning, model for teachers, and provide Math professional development. **Person Responsible:** Courtney Kline (courtney.kline@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 6/2024

Common grade level CLP times for all teachers including ESE, additional CLP meetings after school hours, and Math professional development.

Person Responsible: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 6/2024

#3. 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.

One area of focus is the large number students (241) who were absent 10% or more days.

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

By June 2024, students will improve attendance by decreasing/reducing the number of students absent 10% or more days from 241 to 193 (a 20% decrease).

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

This area of focus will be monitored using data from Power BI and skyward.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

LaKeitha Jackson (lakeitha.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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is positive reinforcement, communicating importance/data to stakeholders, and problem solving as a team for unique circumstances.

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

The rational for selecting these strategies is to build community awareness and support to ensure barriers are removed.

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.

Monthly attendance meetings

Person Responsible: LaKeitha Jackson (lakeitha.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monthly until 6/2024

On first day of student absence, teacher will communicate with parents.

Person Responsible: LaKeitha Jackson (lakeitha.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: on going 6/2024

Quarterly attendance incentives for students.

Person Responsible: LaKeitha Jackson (lakeitha.jackson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: On-going 6/2024

Attendance education for parents at events including, but not limited to Wildcat of the Month, Curriculum Night, PTO/SAC meetings, BINGO for Books, and Title 1 Night

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: On-going 6/2024

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).

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

46% of students in grades k-2 are scoring below the 40th percentile on the PM3 ELA state test..

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

56% of 3rd grade students scored below a level 3 on PM3 ELA state test. 47% of 4th grade students scored below a level 3 on the PM3 ELA state test. 51% of 5th grade students scored below a level 3 on PM3 ELA state test.

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

By June 2024, students in k-2 will decrease the percent of students scoring below the 40th percentile from 46% to 41%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, students in grades 3-5 will increase ELA Achievement by 5%, earning 55% proficiency, on the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This area of focus will be monitored using iReady, state Progress Monitoring, and district tests.

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

Lamb, Brie, brie.lamb@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 evidence-based strategy to being implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning), Differentiated Instruction, and coaching and feedback. Additionally using Benchmark Advance for whole group and small group instruction and LLI for tiered intervention.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Benchmark Advance is our peer-reviewed adopted text book materials for ELA instruction which creates consistency between classrooms and grade levels. Additionally, LLI is a researched based intervention used to provided targeted instruction. Also, coaching will be provided during modeling and CLPs as part of our literacy plan, and our Reading Interventionist will provide tier interventions and monitor all students ELA progress.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for whole group and small group.	Lamb, Brie, brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org
Provide school-based coaching and support in Collaborative Learning and Planning, model for teachers, and provide ELA professional development.	Knab, Heather, heather.knab@stlucieschools.org
Common grade level CLP times for all teachers including ESE, additional CLP meetings after school hours, and ELA professional development.	Lamb, Brie, brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org
Monitor implementation and effectiveness tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.	Ackenbrack, Cara-Ann, cara-ann.ackenbrack@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 dissemination of the SIP to all stakeholders during our SAC/PTO meeting, faculty meetings, emails, and is posted on our school webpage, https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wmp/. The progress of the SIP will be discussed and updated at each meeting as well as access to administration to help review SIP progression with stakeholders when wanting to discuss and review.

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))

Windmill Point plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and community stakeholders with the events planned for all to participate in. Curriculum night, Publix Family Night, Bingo for Books, and many other events are on the calendar with the partnerships of community members to take place throughout the school year. The promotion of the school events allows for relationship building with school staff and families to discuss the needs of students along with supporting one another.

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)

Windmill Point has strategically planned for small group instruction in the classroom with identified students. Windmill Point will also promote an afterschool tutoring program that specific students will be invited to participate in that will promote closing the gap in the identified areas of need.

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))

Windmill Point Elementary School has a partnership with McKinney Vento and Grace Packs to support and supplement the needs of our students and families. This partnership allows for growth and success on all parts.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

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

Yes