Floresta Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Floresta Elementary School

1501 SE FLORESTA DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Floresta Elementary is to facilitate the learning and growth of all students academically , socially, and emotionally. As a collaborative unit, educators provide educational instruction that will lead to the advancement of all students, despite disability, socio-economic hardships or low readiness for learning. We are committed to fostering an environment where students feel safe to share concerns and problem solve through areas of concern for the classroom. Using the Sanford Harmony curriculum, we are teaching appropriate social/emotional skills that will help to benefit students in school and in the community. Student have the opportunity to practice skills learned through the social emotional curriculum in real world settings.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will leave Floresta with mastery of all subject area skills so they are equipped to succeed in their future endeavors. Floresta stakeholders encouraged to actively participate in our school, both formally and informally.

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
Cox, Jane	Assistant Principal	
Aleixo, Janice	Instructional Coach	
Lindh, Valerie	Math Coach	
Furtah, Lauren	Instructional Coach	
Tiegs, Bridgette	Reading Coach	
Torresson, Amanda	Reading 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.

The school leadership team, faculty council and the School Advisory Council will meet monthly to examine school improvement efforts. During each meeting the School Improvement Plan will be discussed. The stakehoders will review and monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. During the first meetings the members will evaluate the effectiveness of last year's school improvement plan and use a problem-solving approach to determine areas of need.

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))

This school improvement plan was developed by the Leadership team and the School Advisory Council. The Leadership team used a Problem-Solving process. The Leadership team will monitor the effectiveness of the plan during the weekly data meetings with the staff. The team will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement of all students. Sign-in sheets and minutes from these meeting will be used for evidence of completion.

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	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: 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	5	48	38	25	30	32	0	0	0	178
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	13	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	2	17	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	30	10	5	25	27	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	42	18	30	26	32	0	0	0	149
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	38	24	38	34	32	0	0	0	170

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	46	44	40	31	35	0	0	0	198

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	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	36	40	41	39	32	45	0	0	0	233
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	4	12	7	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	32	33	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	30	42	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	8	5	2	6	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	0	4	3	24	35	36	0	0	0	102

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	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
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	36	40	41	39	32	45	0	0	0	233
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	4	12	7	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	32	33	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	30	42	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	8	5	2	6	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	0	4	3	24	35	36	0	0	0	102

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	17
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*	47	44	53	50	46	56	46		
ELA Learning Gains				62			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			54		
Math Achievement*	52	52	59	54	43	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				66			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			36		
Science Achievement*	53	49	54	43	50	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	58	59	73			33		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	256
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96
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	26	Yes	4	2
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	58			
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	24	Yes	3	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	58			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	56			

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	47			52			53					62
SWD	22			32			31				4	
ELL	27			34			23				5	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			41			44				5	50
HSP	42			49			50				5	68
MUL	65			75							2	
PAC												
WHT	58			59			66				4	
FRL	44			49			51				5	63

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	50	62	50	54	66	60	43					73
SWD	11	33	29	22	40	33	0					
ELL	24	45	41	29	63	73	22					73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	49	46	34	50	46	29					80
HSP	43	61	59	48	70	72	36					73
MUL	61	44		65	65		50					
PAC												
WHT	67	76		70	74		60					
FRL	47	58	48	50	65	61	39					76

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	46	55	54	47	37	36	46					33
SWD	20	41	45	27	35	42	8					
ELL	25	68		34	53		40					33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	60		32	36		42					
HSP	46	65		44	46		58					41
MUL	38	50		42	18		30					
PAC												
WHT	55	45	45	58	36	30	43					
FRL	43	59	58	42	33	33	41					33

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	46%	5%	54%	-3%
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	54%	52%	2%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	56%	-6%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	51%	-1%

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.

Overall, ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 as measured by FAST is the lowest performance area with 50% proficient. Further analysis reveals third graders performed significantly lower than other grade levels with 41% proficiency. 58% of third graders scored below a Level 3. Additionally, our SWD subgroup performed significantly lower than other subgroups with 10% proficiency.
Floresta Elementary 3rd grade ELA trend data indicate similar results. The major contributing factor leading to last year's and previous years' low performance in 3rd grade is lack of foundational skills including a firm grasp of phonics.

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

No areas experienced a decline. All areas maintained our increased form the previous 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.

When compared to the state average the greatest gap is in 4th grade Math. Floresta's 4th grade Math average is 50 while the state average in 4th grade is 61. A 11-point gap exists. In addition, Floresta has 7 percent more of our students scoring a Level 1 compared to the state average.

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

Science showed the most improvement from 43% proficient in 2022 to 53% proficient in 2023. The contributing factors for this improvement in this area was coaching, small group instruction, Collaborative Learning & Planning sessions and Quality Instruction.

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

Using 2022- 2023 data, attendance 10% or more days is an area of concern. Every day a student is absent is a lost opportunity for learning. Our goal is to have 95% of our students in school daily. The early school years are essential for laying a foundation for strong attendance and academic success in future years. The other potential area of concern is the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency. Our School Improvement Plan will address these two areas of concern. We will work with all stakeholders to improve in both of these areas.

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

1. 3rd grade ELA Proficiency
2. SWD achievement ELA and Math
3. ELA Achievement (all grades)
4. Math Achievement
5. Attendance: Students with 10+ absences

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 Collaborative Planning

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.

Collaborative Planning opportunities will provide time to deepen teachers'
understanding of the content standards, planning standards-based instruction based on the needs of the individual students, and provide student engagement through sharing of interests, strengths, and background knowledge. Through collaborative planning, teachers will be able to share their interests, strengths, background knowledge, and foster cooperative learning strategies. The Administration, Literacy Coaches and the Math Coach will support these sessions. Collaboration among the leadership and grade-level teams will foster positive relationships and enhance student achievement.

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

According to the F.A.S.T. 2022-2023 Data:
50% of students scored proficient in ELA
54% of students scored proficient in Math

By Spring of 2024:
55% of our students will be proficient in ELA
60% of our students will achieve learning gains in ELA
60% of our Lowest 25% percentile will make learning gains in ELA.
67% of our students will be proficient in writing.

60% of our students will be proficient in Math
60% will achieve learning gains in Math
60% of our Lowest 25% percentile will make learning gains in Math.

53% of our students will be proficient in Science

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

A Collaborative Planning Scheduled will be developed to ensure that ELA, Math, and Content planning sessions are held 3-4 times per week. All teachers will be expected to actively participate in the planning sessions and the leadership team will also attend some planning sessions. CLP sessions will be supported by Administration, Instructional Coaches and facilitated by the grade level leader. Meeting agendas will be monitored by the Leadership Team. Administration will also review the lesson plans. Weekly classroom walk-throughs will be conducted by the Leadership Team to ensure that students are engaged in standards-aligned learning tasks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Traci Wilke (traci.wilke@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 Planning will be facilitated by the grade level leader and supported by coaches and administrators. Together we will focus on academic standards and the delivery of standards-based instruction. We will plan Standards-based instruction and design opportunities for students to interact with grade-level new knowledge and deepen their understanding. Throughout the CLP Process, there will be checkpoints. The Leadership Team will monitor to ensure that the CLP meets the needs of the teachers.

We will review CLP Process to ensure that we are building capacity within the grade group. District Assessment Data will also be used to monitor the impact of the CLPs.

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

Collaborative Planning will be essential to building teachers' capacity and enhancing student achievement. Teachers need time to discuss and examine grade-level student work. Teachers need time to work as a grade level team to examine standards, plan to provide Standards-based instruction, and provide instruction for ESSA sub-groups.

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.

1. Grade level teams will cultivate trust and build on strengths and experience.
2. Grade level teams will develop expectations, goals, and assign roles.
3. Grade level teams will participate in CLP 3-4 times per week.
4. Grade level team leaders will facilitate the CLPs, Instructional Coaches and Administrators will support the sessions.
5. Teachers will use quality materials and resources to plan standards-based lessons and deliver quality instruction for all students.
6. Instructional Coaches will monitor instruction, coach, and model for the teachers to ensure that rigorous, standards-based instruction is provided.
During CLPs, we will discuss the following questions:
What is it we want our students to learn?
How will we know if each student has learned it?
How will we respond when some students do not learn it?
How will we ensure that the needs for our ESSA sub-groups are being met?
How can we extend the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Person Responsible: Traci Wilke (traci.wilke@stlucieschools.org)

By When: On-Going

#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 2023 FAST Data 46% of our students are performing below grade level in mathematics.

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

According to our 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. Math Data:
54% of students scored proficient in Math.

By Spring 2024, 60% of our students will be proficient in Math, 60% of our students will achieve learning gains, 60% of our lowest 25%ile will achieve learning gains.

From August 2023- April 2024, students will participate in district and statewide assessments aligned to the BEST Mathematics Standards. The assessment data in Math will show 60% of students performing proficiently.

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

Teacher observational data is correlated to student achievement data.

Administration and Instructional Coaches will:

#1 Observe instruction and provide teacher feedback

#2 Monitor i-Ready Data, FAST PM1/PM2, and district tests.

#3 Attend CLP and closely examine how the CLP impacts student achievement

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valerie Lindh (valerie.lindh@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.)

Teachers will collaborate to strategically deliver standards-based Math instruction. Lessons, discussions, activities, and tasks must reflect the full intent of the grade-level math benchmark. Teachers will Implement the 5-E structure as designed in the math routine. To plan standards-aligned instruction, teachers, coaches, and administration will work collaboratively to implement student-centered mathematics instruction.

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

Teachers who incorporate the 5E Model into their classrooms help students build a strong foundation of knowledge through active participation.

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.

Teachers will collaboratively plan standards-based lessons and instruction.
Math Coach will support the facilitation of collaborative planning.
The leadership team will monitor, district assessment, progress monitoring, and i-Ready data.
The leadership team will provide teachers with feedback.
Targeted grades will attend quarterly teacher bootcamps in mathematics.
The teachers will use Hand2Mind, Daily Math Fluency Kits during the launch portion of the math routine to build numbers sense and fluency using Math Talks and Number Strings.
Teachers in grades K-5 will use the provided Savvas Daily Review spirals during the additional 10 minutes of math instruction to practice previously taught skills.
Students will track their progress using student data notebooks.
Teachers will provide small group instruction to targeted students daily in math.
Teachers will check for understanding and diagnose students' learning needs throughout instruction.
The math coach will monitor instruction, coach, and model for the teachers to ensure that rigorous, standards-based instruction is being provided.

Person Responsible: Traci Wilke (traci.wilke@stlucieschools.org)

By When: ongoing

#3. 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.

Instructional Practice relating to Math for SWD and Instructional Practice relating to ELA for SWD.

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 and Math 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:

Belinda McNeal (belinda.mcneal@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 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. Differentiated instruction allows teachers to meet the needs of all students and especially SWDs to improve learning outcomes. Targeted small group instruction is a strategy that benefits all students and will assist in improving Math fluency 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.

Collaborative Learning and Planning time will be used to explore and plan activities to bridge the learning gap for students with deficits in ELA and Math skills.

Person Responsible: Valerie Lindh (valerie.lindh@stlucieschools.org)

By When: This collaborative learning and planning will be weekly. Spring 2024

#4. 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.

Research has shown that meaningful family engagement positively impacts youth outcomes across various domains including school climate and culture. Furthermore, active engagement of families in the school community reduces chronic absenteeism rates. Attending school regularly helps children feel better about school. Good attendance will help children do well in high school, college, ad at work.

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

To strengthen our family-school connections by sponsoring parent outreach for at risk students, Nights of Family Learning activities and an after school academic tutoring and enrichment program. Floresta Elementary School will improve attendance rates as measured by Average Daily Attendance, Chronic Absenteeism Rates, and students with a 93% attendance rate or higher by cultivating a "Culture of Attendance" school-wide.

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

School counselors and administration will maintain a tracking form to monitor the outcomes for parent outreach activities. Attendance at events and the after-school programming will be documented. In addition, a survey following each family event to obtain parent feedback and suggestions for future activities. School climate survey results will also be monitored. Floresta Elementary School will achieve an Average Daily Attendance rate of 93% or greater in the 2023- 2024 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janice Aleixo (janice.aleixo@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 Parent & Family Engagement Liaison(s) will be utilized to create a comprehensive Parent and Family Engagement Plan. and will be responsible for the following:
•Assist PFE team with organizing school level PFE outlined on PFEP
•Collaborates with PFE team to build capacity with teachers and staff to strengthen school family partnerships.
•Collaborate with grade level teams
•Facilitate capacity building training at faculty meetings or afterschool.
Sprit day each Friday to promote school climate and togetherness.
•Assist with preparing and implementing the school level Parent & Family Engagement Plan.
•Assist with revising the School-Parent Compact.
•Assist in evaluating PFE activities.
•Collect PFE compliance documentation
*Present iAttend campaign
*Provide incentives for attendance
*Communicate to parents about attendance by using Facebook, School Webpage, Marque, newsletters, Skylert calls.
*Guidance Counselors will meet with families about chronic absences and work with families to overcome barriers.

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

A Parent and Family Engagement Plan coordinated by PFEP coordinators promotes a focused approach for planning and implementing family engagement activities based on family needs and input. This focused approach will ensure meaningful activities to increase parent involvement as well as student achievement.

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.

Identify a parent and family engagement (PFE) liaison. The PFE Liaison will receive specialized training to be delivered to faculty/staff to build capacity with strengthening school – family partnerships. The PFE liaison will coordinate family engagement activities.
Develop a comprehensive Parent and Family Engagement Plan PFEP)
Schedule and facilitate a minimum of 5 PFE activities.
Provide opportunities to provide feedback and suggestions for meaningful family engagement events that foster the home-school connection and student achievement.
Facilitate an after school academic tutoring and enrichment program. The tutoring program will include K-5 Reading and Math support, 3-5 Science support, and enrichment.
School counselors and administration will identify at risk students and create support plans for the students and families as appropriate to overcome barriers.

Person Responsible: Traci Wilke (traci.wilke@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Spring 2024

#5. 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.

If we increase students' writing proficiency, we will increase their overall literacy achievement as assessed by the Writing Test (state assessment).

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

According to the 2021 FSA, Text-based Writing Scores reflected that 38% of students were not proficient.

By Spring 2024, 67% of students will be proficient.

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

Teacher observational data is correlated to student achievement data. The Leadership Team will:
#1 Observe instruction and provide teacher feedback
#2 Collect student writing data 3 times per year with common grading utilizing the BEST Rubrics.
#3 Literacy Coach will support teachers and monitor progress with supplemental materials.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Torresson (amanda.torresson@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.)

Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. Within Benchmark Advanced is a writing component that is paced per unit that allows modeling, teacher think-alouds, student thinking time, and student writing. TopScore Writing used as supplemental material has been proven to increase state testing scores in neighboring schools and counties. TopScore Writing will help provide the structure of writing in addition to the Benchmark Advanced curriculum. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. Common grading and student exemplars will be determined during CLPs. Ongoing professional development following the B.E.S.T. writing standards and delivery of instruction will enhance overall student academic achievement.

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

Make writing instruction and support a priority across the curriculum. All staff will follow the recommendations of the School Literacy Team to use TopScore Writing in Grades 3-5 as supplemental writing material in addition to Benchmark Advanced. Students will participate in writing each day, using graphic organizers, focusing on conventions, outlines, and text-based writing strategies, and will place emphasis on grade-level vocabulary while writing. All students will participate in daily peer collaboration throughout the writing process. Teachers will instruct students on how to use the state B.E.S.T. writing rubrics so they can access their writing. Students will be able to determine writing goals based on the monitoring of their current writing levels based on the state B.E.S.T. writing rubrics. Writing skills for all our students will improve. Fourth and Fifth-grade students will meet intended writing benchmarks. The supplemental writing curriculum, TopScore, will be used with fidelity and monitored by the Leadership Team. Students will increase their writing proficiency which will enhance their reading proficiency.

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.

1. Teachers will collaboratively plan standards-based lessons and instructions.
2. Staff will collectively score writing samples from the Dolphin Writes at least once per quarter to maintain consistency in scoring.
3. The leadership team will conduct data chats to monitor progress.
4. The leadership team will provide actionable feedback to teachers.
5. Embedded professional development from the supplemental TopScore curriculum will include discussion, implementation experiences, materials, and questions/concerns.
6. Teachers will check for student understanding and include peer reviews.
7. Grade-level teams will be provided with Literacy Coach support, monitoring, and feedback.

Person Responsible: Amanda Torresson (amanda.torresson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: On-going

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).

As part of the comprehensive needs assessment the Leadership Team and the Faculty council prioritized resources needed for continuous school improvement. The team allocated Title 1 funds for two literacy coaches and one math coach. The Title 1 funds enables sustainable systems and strategies to support the improved outcomes of all stakeholders. The administration ensures appropriate resources are allocated to design a master schedule that allows for common planning time. The time will allow grade-level teachers to collaborate and make data-based decisions for problem-solving and professional development alignment to Florida Standards and lesson study. The following strategies are used to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers:
1. Administration secures quality staff by retention of highly qualified staff.
2. New teachers attend district orientation and school orientation. New staff members are given a highly qualified mentor.
3. Monthly scheduled meetings for new teachers and their mentors are held.
4. Quality Instructional training with follow-up occurs during these meetings.
7. Administration will frequently observe and feedback to all staff members.
8. Instructional staff will be provided extensive, ongoing, job-embedded professional development to ensure they are provided with the resources to be effective and satisfied in their job.
9. Professional Development needs are determined by staff surveys, classroom observations, and data.
10. The faculty works to ensure that all teachers feel valued in their roles and understand the importance of a positive school culture and climate.

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 Grade K, 41% of students scored below the level of proficiency on the STAR Early Literacy. In Grade 1, 49% of students scored below the level of proficiency and in Grade 2, 33% scored below the level of proficiency on the STAR Reading. Based on the above data, it was determined that additional instruction in the area of foundational reading on targeted skills is needed. Foundational reading skills for early literacy consists of the knowledge and skills needed to support successful reading. Proficiency in foundational reading skills is a predictor of future reading success that supports long term academic achievement. Teachers will implement targeted small group remedial instruction using materials and resources that are aligned with the Science of Reading. Materials and resources include but are not limited to: Benchmark Advanced Differentiated lessons, Benchmark Advanced Phonics Skill bags, and daily foundational literacy instruction in the targeted area of phonemic awareness using Heggerty.

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

House Bill 7011 RAISE
The RAISE program establishes criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria include schools with students in grades Kindergarten through five, where 50 percent or more of its students, in any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment ** (This means grade 3, 4, & 5)

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

According to the 2022-2023 STAR Literacy Data:
59% of grade K students demonstrated at or above proficiency and 41% scored below grade level proficiency. By the 23/24 school year 60% of the grade K students will be at or above proficiency on STAR.
51% of grade 1 students demonstrated at or above proficiency and 49% scored below grade level proficiency. By the 23/24 school year 56% of the grade 1 students will be at or above proficiency on STAR.
67% of grade 2 students demonstrated at or above proficiency and 33% scored below grade level proficiency. By the 23/24 school year 68% of the grade 2 students will be at or above proficiency on STAR.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to our 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. ELA Data:
43% of the Grade 3 students scored Level 3 or above and 50% or more scored below Level 3. By the end of the 23/24 school year 50% of grade 3 students will score a level 3 or higher.

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.

Teacher observational data is correlated to student achievement data. The Leadership Team will:
#1 Observe instruction and provide teacher feedback
#2 Monitor i-Ready, District Progress Toward Mastery, District, and State-wide Assessment Data
#3 Attend CLPs and closely examine how the CLPs impact student achievement

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

Torresson, Amanda, amanda.torresson@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?

We will use Progress Monitoring, District Performance Toward Mastery, i-Ready, formative assessments, and unit assessment data to monitor students' mastery of content standards. We will use an instructional cycle to ensure that students are learning. We will track students' progress and design targeted small-group instruction to meet the individual needs of each learner. Primary teachers in K-1 will

use Heggerty to support daily phonemic awareness instruction for all students. In addition, primary teachers in grades 1-2 will utilize Benchmark Advance Phonics Skill Bags to individualize instruction in differentiated small groups as remediation. According to St. Lucie Public School MTSS Manual, TIER II students will be identified if they fall into the bottom 15% quartile. A focus on Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan). Classes will use Benchmark Advanced System and differentiated small-group instruction. Benchmark Advance Intervention kits will be utilized for Tier II intervention for students who have deficits in Phonological Awareness/Phonemic Awareness, Reading Horizons will be the intervention for students that have deficits in Phonics, and LLI will be used as an intervention for students who have a deficit in fluency and comprehension. The instructional coaches will support CLPs and the implementation of the curriculum. According to St. Lucie Public School MTSS Manual, TIER III students will be identified if they fall into the bottom 5% quartile. For Tier III intervention, students will use UFLI for Phonics and i-Ready Tools for Instruction for comprehension and fluency. The MTSS Core team is comprised of the leadership team, instructional coaches, interventionists, and school counselors will meet on a regular basis to determine if groups need adjustments throughout the year.

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?

Data will be used to determine intervention strategies. The interventionists will design a schedule based on assessment data. In addition to the reading block, students who are reading below grade level will be assigned to a reading intervention group. Teachers will use supplemental Benchmark Advance Intervention Kit, Reading Horizons, or LLI Reading Resources to improve their reading skills, depending on the students' need for intervention.
Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. Our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student 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
Set goals and track progress. Use i-Ready, Progress Monitoring, and Unit Assessment Data to monitor the learning and support students as they set reasonable goals. Students will track their progress, set goals, reflect upon their work, and have regular conferences with their teacher. Organize students so that they interact with content. Group students so that they practice skills, strategies, and processes. Reteach and modify tasks to support the students. Support students as they examine their reasoning. Provide questions that prompt students to elaborate and think critically. Teachers will attend CLP 3-4 times per week. During planning, they will plan standards-based lessons/units and align these lessons to instructional resources. Teachers will use the instructional data to plan instruction that will close the achievement gap.	Tiegs, Bridgette, bridgette.tiegs@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.

1. Parent Right to Know Letter: Parents of students in Title I schools, must receive notification that they have the right to request and receive information on the professional qualifications of their child's classroom teachers and paraprofessionals.
2.Annual Title I Meeting and SAC Meetings: At the beginning of each year, Floresta holds an Annual Title I Meeting for all parents and monthly School Advisory Council Meetings for all parents, business and community members. The purpose of these meetings are to inform parents/families of the school's participation in the Title I program, to ask for feedback into the Title I program, and to provide other parent notifications.
3. All correspondences regarding Title I and family events are provided in multiple languages including, letters, emails, phone messages....In addition, all event presentations are translated in multiple languages.

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))

1. Identify a parent and family engagement (PFE) liaison. The PFE Liaison will receive specialized training to be delivered to faculty/staff to build capacity with strengthening school – family partnerships.
2. The PFE liaison will coordinate family engagement activities.
3. Develop a comprehensive Parent and Family Engagement Plan PFEP)
https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/flo/
4. Schedule and facilitate a minimum of 5 PFE activities.
5. Provide opportunities to provide feedback and suggestions for meaningful family engagement events that foster the home-school connection and student achievement.

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)

1. Facilitate an after school academic tutoring and enrichment program. The tutoring program will include K-Reading and Math support, 3-5 Science support, and enrichment.
2. School counselors and administration will identify at risk students and create support plans for the students and families as appropriate.

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

na

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))

na

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))

na

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).

na

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))

na

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

na

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: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$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