White City Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

White City Elementary School

905 W 2ND ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34982

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

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.

The mission of White City Elementary is to collaborate as a learning organization while engaging the minds of our students every day through quality work. All students will develop to their fullest potential, respect themselves and others, and acquire a love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

White City Elementary School, in partnership with parents and community members, will become a premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. White City Elementary School's name is synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our promise is to focus on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging, and satisfying work for every student, every day. This is the Wildcat way!

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Laoutas, Alexandra	Principal	
Gieseler, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Steele, Danielle	Reading Coach	
Miller, Alicia	Math Coach	

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.

One strategy is monthly school improvement meetings with teachers, administrators, parents, and community members. Additionally, conducting regular surveys among parents and families provides valuable insights, and we also gained input from our Community Partnership cabinet meetings.

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))

Our school improvement plan will be closely monitored regularly. Our school principal will attend monthly meetings with an executive director to ensure that progress is being made. Additionally, we will monitor

progress during SAC meetings where all stakeholders are present and have ongoing data chats with teachers during collaborative planning.

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	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	30	37	34	16	13	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	10	30	23	2	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	2	19	33	25	2	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	24	10	16	31	30	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	2	32	35	48	22	25	0	0	0	164
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	22	40	44	22	29	0	0	0	160
	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	2	39	49	57	29	32	0	0	0	208

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	0	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	41	36	31	21	34	32	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	2	4	18	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	48	31	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	32	42	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	5	9	5	5	0	0	0	26

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	2	0	18	35	40	0	0	0	96

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	41	36	31	21	34	32	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	2	4	18	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	48	31	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	32	42	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	5	9	5	5	0	0	0	26

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	2	0	18	35	40	0	0	0	96

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
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*	30	44	53	34	46	56	25		
ELA Learning Gains				54			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			50		
Math Achievement*	45	52	59	44	43	50	27		
Math Learning Gains				61			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			33		
Science Achievement*	35	49	54	33	50	59	26		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	58	59	67			47		

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	199
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	1	Yes	4	3
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	43			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	31	Yes	3	2
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	52			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	30			45			35					62
SWD	0			4							3	
ELL	32			53			35				5	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			41			13				5	57
HSP	33			48			42				5	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40			52			58				3	
FRL	30			46			34				5	59

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	34	54	47	44	61	67	33					67
SWD	11	38		22	62		20					
ELL	31	52	60	45	67	70	29					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	55	31	37	53	54	34					68
HSP	37	58	61	49	63		33					65
MUL	33			75								
PAC												
WHT	27	48		41	75							
FRL	33	55	47	41	60	67	29					64

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	25	32	50	27	22	33	26					47
SWD	5	27		0	8							
ELL	24	36	55	28	26	33	27					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16	40	60	21	23		15					53
HSP	30	31		33	25	40	32					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	26	15		21	14		29					
FRL	22	33	47	24	24	35	20					48

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	36%	46%	-10%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
03	2023 - Spring	25%	42%	-17%	50%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	52%	-9%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	56%	-11%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	48%	-10%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	47%	-13%	51%	-17%

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.

ELA achievement was the lowest performance. One factor contributing to the low ELA performance is the lack of content knowledge and pedagogy among teachers. We have teachers with one to three years of experience who need help engaging students, effectively conveying information, and addressing misconceptions. Students experienced gaps in learning over the last three years.

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

ELA achievement did not decline or increase, from the prior year.

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.

ELA achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

Math achievement showed the most improvement last year. Our school implemented several new actions to enhance students' learning experiences. These included student-led conferences, daily CLP, fluency book study as professional development, and monitoring students' progress in iReady.

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

Reflection on EWS data, K-2 ELA and school wide discipline are our areas of concern.

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

1- Increase learning gains for ELA & Math
2- Increase learning gains for BQ- ELA & Math
3- Improve ELA achievement for SWD
4- Increase science achievement
5- Decrease ODR's to improve school wide culture and environment

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Analysis of student achievement subgroup data indicates students with disabilities are not achieving at the same rate as their non-disabled peers in reading.

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

The percentage of students with disabilities demonstrating learning gains in ELA will increase by 25%, based on FAST Progress Monitoring data.

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

B.E.S.T. standards will be monitored through data from FAST progress monitoring and unit assessments. Areas of need will be retaught to improve proficiency within the standards of concern. Student progress will be monitored based on Progress Monitoring Data and Unit Assessment growth with assessments of similar standard types.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@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.)

Both Classroom and Support Teachers will provide standards-based differentiated instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities. This strategy can be used in both whole group and small group instruction to support learning.

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

Differentiated instruction allows teachers to meet the needs of all students and especially SWDs to improve learning outcomes. Benchmark Advance and Really Great Reading supplemental materials have components to increase both fluency and comprehension and is a strategy that benefits all students and will assist in improving reading proficiency through meeting the diverse needs of students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

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

62% of students felt that they were treated well by their peer and 131 students were absent more than 10% of the school year.

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

The number of students missing more the 10% of school will decrease. The number of students who feel that they are treated well by their peers will increase.

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

Weekly attendance meeting through TEAMS
Monthly attendance committee meetings
ODR's and Spring Climate Survey

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@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.)

School wide PBIS and monthly attendance activities from Attendance Works will be implemented as interventions.

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

Research shows that students who feel a sense of connection to their school are less likely to miss days and contribute to a more positive school culture.

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 PBIS activities for all students.

Person Responsible: Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)

By When: May 2024.

Attendance awards by class, grade each month and quarter.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

ELA learning gains for the L25 have decreased from 50% to 47%.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, ELA learning gains for
all subgroups will increase to 60%

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

This will be monitored through district-created unit assessments,
state FAST progress monitoring and by monitoring student work
during collaborative planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Reading coach will support rigorous standards-based planning and
delivery of content learning. Common collaborative planning
focusing on the standards for grade-level instruction. Focus on
fluency strategies for grades 2-5

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

Within grades 3-5 ELA, 80% of the teachers have less than 3-5
year of teaching reading instruction in their grade level. The
reading coach will support teachers in planning.

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.

Coach and Admin will facilitate collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Danielle Steele (danielle.steele@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 2023

Fluency routine in grades 2-5

Person Responsible: Danielle Steele (danielle.steele@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 2023

#4. 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.

65% of 5th grade students were scored a level one or two on the
Science SSA in 2023.

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, Science achievement will
be 44%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored using district unit assessments,
PENDA reports and classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alicia Miller (alicia.miller@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. Ensuring wide reading from complex text that varies in length.
2. Making close reading and rereading of texts central to science lessons.
3. Providing extensive research and writing opportunities (claims and
evidence).
4. Hand on lab experiences will also be embedded throughout the year.
5. Utilizing Penda during small group instruction

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

The teacher in 5th grade is new to the content area. Students have not had the hands-on experience to build background knowledge. Students often struggle with the reading comprehension and understanding how answer higher level questions.

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.

Arrange for collaborative planning to create lesson to meet the full intent of the standards, with district support. Plan for hand on lab experiences to reinforce standards and concepts.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 2023

Utilize J & J Bootcamp materials to provide additional supplemental instruction.

Person Responsible: Alicia Miller (alicia.miller@stlucieschools.org)

By When: December 2023

Have identified students stay afterschool for tutoring.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

By When: December 2023

Arrange for collaborative planning to create lesson to meet the full intent of the standards, with district support. Plan for hand on lab experiences to reinforce standards and concepts.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 2023

Utilize J & J Bootcamp materials to provide additional supplemental instruction.

Person Responsible: Alicia Miller (alicia.miller@stlucieschools.org)

By When: December 2023

Have identified students stay afterschool for tutoring.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

By When: December 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).

The data was thoroughly reviewed to assess funding requirements and allocation strategies. This process ensured that resources are distributed in alignment with specific needs—the analysis aimed to optimize resource utilization and prioritize critical areas. By evaluating the data, funding decisions from funding sources such as Title One Budget, 1010 budget, and Community Partnership grant were made with a focus on maximizing impact and efficiency.

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

In grades Kindergarten through second at White City Elementary the percentage of students, based on 2022-2023 end of year Star Assessment, who were not on track to score a level three or above on the statewide standardized ELA assessment was 64%. To increase student mastery of literacy skills White City Elementary plans to incorporate the following instructional practices; In Kindergarten and first grades (35% on grade level) there will be a focus on explicit and systematic phonics instruction with an intentional emphasis in text and written practice opportunities to build competence and confidence. Teacher training and professional development focused on best practices on phonetic principles and word recognition. In second grade (40% on grade level) interventions will be targeted for students in need of explicit phonics instruction. The grade level and instruction will focus on increased fluency in grade level complex text. Teachers will be provided instructional techniques and resources with a fluency focus. Additionally, text-based comprehension steeped in reading, oral, and written response will be utilized to continue to foster enhanced literacy development.

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

In grades third through fifth at White City Elementary the percentage of students scoring at a level three or above, based on 2022-2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment was 34%. In third grade interventions will be targeted, research based, and explicit designed to address students in need of explicit phonics instruction and reading comprehension. The grade level and instructional practices will focus on increased fluency in grade level complex text. Teachers will be provided instructional techniques and resources with a fluency focus. Additionally, text-based comprehension steeped in reading, oral, and written response will be utilized to continue to foster enhanced literacy development. In grades four (37% on grade level) and grade five (39% on grade level) higher order thinking questions with oral and written responses will be a focus. Professional development and instructional practices will be aligned to responding to text through questioning, written response, and responding to others.

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

In grades kindergarten through second at White City Elementary, the percentage of students using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, will increase from 36% proficient or on grade level to 42% proficient.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In grades third through fifth at White City Elementary, the percentage of students using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, will increase from 34% proficient or on grade level to 42% proficient.

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.

White City Elementary will utilize the upcoming FAST assessments to provide ongoing status checks on overall progress towards meeting measurable outcomes. Additionally, the campus will utilize various curriculum-based assessments to provide formative checks on student progress. These assessments, coupled with teacher running records completed quarterly will allow stakeholders to monitor student progress and provide enrichments and/or interventions to ensure goals are obtained.

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

Gieseler, Lauren, lauren.gieseler@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 practices and programs implemented to achieve the measure outcomes in grades kindergarten through fifth grade include but are not limited to; the use of Benchmark Advanced, a state approved, core-literacy program designed to meet proficiency goals. Additionally, researched based interventions will be utilized to ensure learning deficits are lessoned and student proficiency increased.

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?

The rationale for selected the practices and programs in kindergarten through fifth grades are evidenced based programs that are designed to address the identified needs of students. The practices selected in White City Elementary's School Improvement Plan have illustrated a proved record of effectiveness for the
students served at the school with substations data to support use.

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 coaching will be provided in collaborative lesson planning to ensure grade level measurable objectives are achieved through identified instruction practices.	Steele, Danielle, danielle.steele@stlucieschools.org
Professional learning will focus on the instructional practices at each grade level to increase student proficiency	Gieseler, Lauren, lauren.gieseler@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.

Our school employs a multi-faceted approach that combines social media updates, ClassDojo interactions, SAC meetings, and traditional communication methods maximizes the reach and impact of disseminating SIP information across various channels. Monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings provide an opportunity for in-depth discussions about the SIP, allowing stakeholders to collaborate, share feedback, and gain a comprehensive understanding of the plan's implementation. https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wce/

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school addresses building a positive relationship by inviting and allowing various organizations to partner with the school to provide resources to meet the needs of students and families.
The United Way of St. Lucie is the lead nonprofit for WCE's Community Partnership School, employing one full-time and one part-time staff to work with the administration to bring funding, services, and resources to
families, students, and teachers. Programs and services are divided into three categories, though not limited to these categories: Family and Community Engagement, Expanded Learning, and Health and Wellness.
The school builds positive relationships and environments for families and students through these efforts.
White City Elementary will host several parent events. Parents, teachers, and community members will be invited to participate in our monthly school advisory council meetings. During the SAC meetings,

stakeholders will learn about student achievement goals and our school improvement plan. The SAC will oversee the budget and monitor school improvement targets as we support the needs of our students. We
will celebrate Literacy Week and Student Led Conferences. Monthly evening events will be planned with our CPS partners, 21st-century coordinator, and Title One liaison.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The school will actively monitor lesson plans to enhance the academic program to ensure alignment with curriculum standards and effective teaching strategies. Protective measures will be implemented to safeguard instructional time from interruptions, creating a focused learning environment. Additionally, the school will closely oversee allocating and utilizing resources to optimize classroom interventions, ensuring students receive appropriate support. The academic program aims to foster a more structured and productive educational experience for all students through these measures.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan is formulated through a collaborative effort involving federal, state, and local services and their respective resources and programs. The aim is to ensure student success across all grade levels and subgroups, as evidenced by increased learning gains.

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))

A referral system is employed to identify students who may require counseling and mental health services, often initiated by teachers, parents, or the students themselves. The threat management team reviews classroom incident reports monthly to determine support for struggling students.

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))

Through Kids at Hope, students are taught to envision and mentally time travel to their futures in each of four destinations Home and Family, Education and Career, Community and Service, and Hobbies and Recreation.

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).

Our school has a School-wide PBIS program. Implementing a tiered model throughout the school helps us prevent and address problem behavior. We also have early intervention services available to us;

every month, our data is reviewed to identify any students needing extra interventions to help them succeed.

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))

The professional learning liaison employs a systematic approach to gather data through teacher surveys. These surveys help identify specific areas where teachers seek professional learning. By analyzing this data, the liaison can tailor the professional learning programs to address the teachers' identified needs, ensuring that the training aligns with their goals and challenges. This data-driven approach enhances the effectiveness of professional learning, fostering growth and improvement among educators and recruiting and retaining quality teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our school organizes a special event called "Kindergarten Kick-off" to help ease the transition from preschool to kindergarten. It's an excellent opportunity for parents and kids to get familiar with the school environment, meet their new teachers and classmates, and learn about the curriculum and expectations. The school also provides summer learning packs to families, which contain fun and educational activities that kids can do at home. This is a great way to keep the kids engaged and motivated during the summer break while reinforcing the skills they learned in preschool.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$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