

St. Lucie Public Schools

St. Lucie West K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

St. Lucie West K 8 School

1501 SW CASHMERE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

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

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 St. Lucie West K-8 School is to ensure a safe, challenging and engaging learning environment, tailored to individual student needs, while preparing for future success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Lucie West K-8 School will provide a high quality education to a diverse community of lifelong learners where all share the responsibility of learning.

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
Lezeau, Joseph	Principal	
Monroe, Lorie	Assistant Principal	
Sexton, Tari	Assistant Principal	
Sutton, Barbara	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Involving stakeholders and gathering input for the SIP involves several factors. First, we as the school leadership identify the purpose and importance of the plan to our stakeholders. We conduct regularly meetings on the third Tuesday of every month to monitor the progress of the SIP. We gathered data to identify challenges and potential improvements by prioritizing our resources appropriately. Develop a draft plan incorporating their input and share it for further discussion. Adjust the plan based on the input received, ensuring a sense of ownership and commitment from stakeholders.

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))

Monitoring the SIP and ensuring its effective implementation is crucial for enhancing student achievement and addressing the achievement gap. Regular monitoring and evaluation of the SIP progress are essential to tracking its impact on our school's ability to meet the state's academic

standards, especially for students facing the greatest achievement disparities. These are the steps we are going to take to monitor and revise for continuous improvement:

- a. Set achievable goals
- b. Data collection and analysis
- c. Hold regular meetings on the third Tuesday of month with all stakeholders
- d. Assessment of our strategies and interventions
- e. Identify challenges as opportunities for improvement
- f. Stakeholder engagement for feedback on the SIP progress
- g. Revise the plan as needed

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	74%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	67%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	9	39	34	38	35	39	59	64	73	390	
One or more suspensions	0	8	4	7	12	14	16	48	27	136	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	7	12	16	0	0	0	3	3	41	
Course failure in Math	0	9	23	38	0	0	0	7	14	91	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	34	45	12	46	39	34	67	69	346	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	43	23	44	50	32	30	52	69	343	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	40	52	59	58	52	71	75	74	487	

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	44	48	58	58	50	54	88	95	497	

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	1	1	1	3	4	5	2	4	3	24	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	53	45	40	44	46	52	79	76	86	521	
One or more suspensions	8	11	17	30	14	31	70	83	57	321	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	9	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	1	1	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	35	60	88	57	267	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	40	24	48	92	75	49	0	328	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	13	11	10	6	61	69	50	226	

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	4	9	15	30	36	48	108	114	79	443	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	53	45	40	44	46	52	79	76	86	521
One or more suspensions	8	11	17	30	14	31	70	83	57	321
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	9	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	1	1	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	35	60	88	57	267
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	40	24	48	92	75	49	0	328
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	13	11	10	6	61	69	50	226

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	4	9	15	30	36	48	108	114	79	443

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	52	50	53	51	53	55	55		
ELA Learning Gains				51			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			40		
Math Achievement*	51	51	55	54	41	42	50		
Math Learning Gains				65			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			40		
Science Achievement*	53	52	52	51	50	54	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	61	71	68	59	55	59	57		
Middle School Acceleration	80	75	70	87	50	51	82		
Graduation Rate		90	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		69	53		74	70			
ELP Progress	40	44	55	39	78	70	61		

* 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	23	Yes	4	3
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	48			
HSP	52			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	2
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	52			
HSP	54			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	51			

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	52			51			53	61	80			40
SWD	17			20			23	21			6	36
ELL	27			28			36	43			6	40
AMI												
ASN	74			79							2	
BLK	46			43			44	54	76		7	41
HSP	49			47			52	61	71		7	39
MUL	64			61			69	63			5	
PAC												
WHT	60			59			63	68	87		6	
FRL	46			43			49	57	80		7	46

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	51	51	41	54	65	61	51	59	87			39
SWD	11	28	27	20	40	37	13	36				
ELL	32	38	37	38	56	46	28	48	82			39
AMI												
ASN	63	42		81	83							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	47	48	31	43	62	61	49	56	83			36
HSP	47	47	46	54	65	59	46	53	83			38
MUL	56	53	50	61	73	50	57					
PAC												
WHT	57	57	43	63	66	66	55	65	95			
FRL	44	49	36	46	63	60	44	53	83			30

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	55	52	40	50	44	40	59	57	82			61
SWD	25	39	33	25	40	39	24	25				
ELL	37	45	32	36	40	43	32	43				61
AMI												
ASN	75	69		94	77							
BLK	48	51	53	37	40	31	41	48	71			
HSP	51	50	34	50	40	41	60	62	79			57
MUL	55	38	10	56	35		59	42				
PAC												
WHT	64	57	37	58	50	50	70	58	90			
FRL	49	46	37	43	41	40	50	55	83			55

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	60%	46%	14%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	43%	0%	47%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	56%	43%	13%	47%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
06	2023 - Spring	50%	42%	8%	47%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	42%	3%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	54%	-7%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	38%	3%	48%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	56%	-3%	61%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	43%	4%	55%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	48%	16%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	41%	5%	44%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	47%	13%	51%	9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	34%	55%	50%	39%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	66%	-6%

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 was the lowest performance data component. Contributing factors leading to the drop in performance were new state assessment and the lack of qualified teachers across grade bands. Below are the outcomes by grade based on the school's assessment for matched scores:

3rd- 43%

4th- 54%

5th- 61%

6th- 53%

7th- 42%

8th- 58%

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

Based on the 2021-22 proficiency data compared to 2022-2023, 8th grade science proficiency scores dropped by 11%. The major contributing factor to this was the lack of a qualified teacher for the course.

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

The greatest gap compared to the state average was 3rd grade math, which was a 15% decrease. Contributing factors were new online state assessment, new math standards, and new math curriculum.

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

The most improved area was 8th grade ELA, which was a 9% increase.

Actions taken include the following:

- Literacy Coach
- Effective professional learning communities
- Aggressive monitoring
- Feedback Fridays
- Tier 1 supplemental intervention

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

Attendance

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming school year is a focus on instructional pedagogy, ELA across grade bands 3-8, climate/culture and teacher collective efficacy.

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Literacy performance decreased across several subgroups. Based on the data, we have identified and strategically targeted these students to provide them with intense, remedial instruction to supplement their Tier I curriculum. This targeted instruction can help to narrow the gap they have and move towards learning gains and ultimately proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students within the identified subgroups below the 41% mark (17% for SWD in ELA) on our ESSA data will increase overall performance by 16%. We anticipate seeing an overall increase in this performance area to 33%.

Monitoring:

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

Collaborative planning time will be scheduled at the start of the day so that all instructional staff members can attend content area planning. Teachers will use CLPs to discuss all technology-based platforms, summative and formative data.

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:

Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@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. Groups will be fluid and flexible.

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.

Create double block classes for small group instruction time during reading and math classes daily.

Person Responsible: Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

By When: ongoing throughout the year.

Teachers will be trained in Really Great Reading Supplemental Materials for elementary and middle school teachers.

Person Responsible: Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

By When: October/November 2023

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Through teacher observation and teacher survey feedback, collective teacher efficacy was lower than expected.

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 teams will facilitate their CLPs through the gradual release model. We expect to see an increase in the percentage of teachers that are more in favor in the area of culture and environment on the survey.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and coaches are attending all CLPs every week. The desired outcome will be the gradual release of admin in the lead role to the team functioning without the need for admin to lead.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teacher Collective Efficacy, by John Hattie, is a shared belief among a group of teachers that their combined efforts can positively influence student learning outcomes. When practiced with fidelity, Teacher Collective Efficacy can significantly improve student learning outcomes in various ways:

High Expectations

Collaborative problem solving

Effective Instructional practices

Data-Driven Decision Making

Support for Professional Learning using the district's CLP's Facilitator model

Shared Responsibility

Positive School Culture

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

John's Hattie's research on Visible Learning and effect sizes concludes a quantitative measure of impact to various educational practices on student learning outcomes. The effect size of Visible Learning by John Hattie indicates that Teacher Collective Efficacy has an effect size of 1.57, meaning that when implemented with fidelity student learning gains will increase over one and a half years of academic progress. By leveraging this powerful approach to enhancing student learning outcomes, SharkNation will promote a culture of continuous improvement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 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.

Teacher hours adjusted to ensure 40 minutes of collaborative planning 3-4 times per week.

Person Responsible: Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Start on 8/15/2023

Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday mornings every week are sacred collaborative planning time.

Person Responsible: Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#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.

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

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 Math will be at least 25%, based on FAST Progress Monitoring data.

Monitoring:

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

Collaborative planning time will be scheduled at the start of the day so that all instructional staff members can attend content area planning. Teachers will use CLPs to discuss all technology-based platforms, summative and formative data.

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:

Tari Sexton (tari.sexton@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. 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.

Middle school students will be in 90-minute block classe for small group instruction daily.

Person Responsible: Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August 10

Math interventionist will work with small groups to support learning.

Person Responsible: Barbara Sutton (barbara.sutton@stlucieschools.org)

By When: ongoing weekly schedule

ESE teachers will collaboratively plan with gen ed teachers weekly to ensure standards are being taught in the ESE support and resource classes.

Person Responsible: Tari Sexton (tari.sexton@stlucieschools.org)

By When: ongoing weekly

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 following personnel allocations were specifically designed to support our school's needs.

In the area of literacy, we have hired a literacy coach and an interventionist.

In the area of math, we have hired a math coach and an interventionist.

School Advisory Council (SAC)

Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO)

Partnership with District Administrator on Special Assignment overseeing grants and services

Collaboration with curriculum department to fund approved resources

Collaboration with Federal and Special Programs Manager for Title I to plan budgets

Partner with Coordinator of Title I to plan parent involvement events and resources

iReady supplemental resources with targeted instruction based on student diagnostic results

In addition, for the 2023-2024 school year, grades 3 and 4 will departmentalize allowing teachers to become experts in their content area.

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

n/a

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

3rd grade reading proficiency on 2023 FAST is 43%, which will be the 4th grade cohort for the 2023-2034 school year.

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

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of 2024, 4th grade reading proficiency will increase by 6% to bring our overall proficiency rating to 49%.

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.

Data collection will include:

FAST PM1, PM2, PM3

- Unit Assessments – every 3 weeks
 - Coach Logs – monthly
 - Check for Understanding
- IReady Diagnostic and instruction

Actions for support and continuous support and improvement

Collaborative Learning and Planning will take place weekly (3xs per week) to focus on B.E.S.T. standards-based instruction

- Coaching cycles will be leveraged to impact student achievement.
- School based literacy team walks will focus on specific components of the literacy routine based on data.
- Data Chats
- Professional development

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lezeau, Joseph, joseph.lezeau@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?

Elementary schools (K-5) must teach reading in a dedicated, uninterrupted block of time of at least 90 minutes daily to all students. The reading block will include whole group instruction utilizing an evidence-based sequence of reading instruction and small group differentiated instruction in order to meet individual student needs.

K-5 will be using the following instructional materials from the state adopted list: Benchmark Advance Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through Grade 3. Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters, strong evidence. These recommendation(s) were built into the program by explicit teaching of phonemes and their connections to letters and sounds.

These programs will be monitored with reading walkthroughs with feedback on reading instruction aligned to reading practices. Weekly data chats will be conducted using our district assessment platform, Performance Matters to analyze data from assessments, as well as using PM1 and PM2 data.

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 resources being utilized are approved by the district's curriculum department based on the states approved adopted list. Resources selected include the following:

Benchmark Advance Intervention Kit (6 components of reading)

- Reading Horizons (Strong) (phonics)
- Leveled Literacy Intervention (Strong) (6 components of reading)
- iReady Instructional PDFs (Promising) (6 components of reading)
- Quick Reads (Strong) (oral reading fluency)

- Florida Center of Reading Research Student Center Activities (6 components of reading)
- SRA Corrective Reading (6 components of reading)

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Collaborative Planning built into master schedule. Literacy coach will plan with 3rd grade weekly. Additionally, the coach will conduct coaching cycles with all 3rd grade ELA teachers. The assessments (PM1, PM2, district assessments, and classroom assessments) will be utilized according to district scope and sequence. Once assessments are completed, immediate data chats will occur with the literacy coach and admin to determine areas of need. Professional Learning will occur during the collaborative planning time. Items such as how to incorporate an evidence-based strategy to support learners on certain skills will be embedded throughout the week.</p>	<p>Sutton, Barbara, barbara.sutton@stlucieschools.org</p>
<p>Departmentalized 3rd grade to build stronger capacity in ELA teachers. The Literacy leadership team, including administration, determined the need for more focused planning in 3rd grade. The team determined that by separating out ELA from math, we are able to host more detailed and focused collaborative planning. These laser-focused planning sessions allow for more in-depth understanding of standards and pedagogy in the area of ELA. The various assessments administered throughout the year are immediately analyzed to drive next steps. The data provides the teachers/coaches/admin with a detailed look at where our areas of need remain. Based upon the data from the assessments, the coaches/admin collaborate with the teachers to build capacity in their craft including how to intervene appropriately and work towards mastery.</p>	<p>Sutton, Barbara, barbara.sutton@stlucieschools.org</p>
<p>Strategic staff scheduling. Personnel are vital resources to attain student success. The addition of a certified teacher allows for additional intensive remediation of identified students in all 3rd grade classes based upon our data. The interventionist provides intensive tiered interventions for our Tier 2 and Tier 3 identified students on a weekly basis, based upon need.</p>	<p>Lezeau, Joseph, joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SIP and progress will be disseminated during our monthly SAC meetings that occur on the Tuesday of every month. Stakeholders are provided opportunities to collaborate with school administration team.

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))

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/slk/>

Skyward Family Access is a method for all families to access their child's progress. In addition to Skyward, our school has developed a school info app where families receive notifications of upcoming events, important information, and an additional means for them to get in touch with us.

We host monthly School Advisory Committee meetings in which all stakeholders are welcome. The meeting is a forum for stakeholder to keep informed of what is going on with our school and the progress we are making.

We hos

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)

Our school has made great strides to raise the academic bar here at SLWK8. Some of the notable changes include adjusting teacher time to provide 40 minutes of uninterrupted planning every morning for quality lesson planning. Additionally, we have created a specialized middle school schedule that will allow for increased engagement in all classrooms. We have also re-designed the middle school schedule to include 90-minute blocks for all students in both reading and math.

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))

St. Lucie Public Schools in coordination with the Federal Programs & Grants manager to prioritize the needs of the school to ensure we as a learning organization are utilizing our federal funds to increase student learning.

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))

Through our guidance department we work with the mental health collaborative to provide mentoring, counseling services, and social skills. Some of the programs include, Safer Smarter Kids, Too Good for Drugs (by New Horizons), etc. We have many social workers that work in collaboration with our school both on campus and in the home.

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))

Our middle school students are afforded the opportunity to take a career and technical education class as part of their elective wheel. Career discovery is one of our elective classes. All 8th grade students participate in Career Planning through their US History class. Other opportunities include STEAM and Business education as choices in our middle school electives.

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).

Students in need of additional support are identified through our Problem-Solving Team process. Once a student has been identified as needing additional support, they are placed in a Tier 2 intervention based upon areas of need. This stage is monitored through quarterly response meetings and the data is analyzed. If a positive response is shown and demonstrating grade level mastery, they will exit the intervention. If the student is not showing growth, additional support will be implemented through Tier 3 interventions. This process is done for both academics and behavior.

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))

Our district provides professional learning catalogs during our pre-service week as well as designated district days throughout the year.

At the school level, we utilize teacher feedback, survey data, and academic assessment results to determine areas of need for professional learning. Our school-based professional learning can be delivered by our coaching team, administration, or professional learning consultants.

Additionally, all new teachers are included in the NEST program. This program is focused on retaining new teachers as they learn their craft. Monthly meetings focus on teacher need including a deep understanding of our Framework for Quality Teaching and Learning.

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))

We host a Kindergarten Kickoff every summer. During this week, we have incoming Kindergarten students come to school half days. This program allows the students to acclimate to the kindergarten setting and provides the teachers the opportunity to build relationships and monitor academic levels prior to the first day of school.

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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