

St. Lucie Public Schools

Treasure Coast High 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Treasure Coast High School

1000 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Treasure Coast High School is to ensure that all of our students are immersed in a safe, caring, academically challenging learning environment, and graduate from Treasure Coast High School. We believe all students can and will be successful.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is grounded in a belief that any student can be successful during their high school experience when immersed in a caring, challenging, and relevant learning environment. Our faculty and staff are selected based on their expertise and desire to help students succeed. It is our sole desire to witness the success of each student. Our pledge is to make sure each student at TCHS has a unique and fulfilling experience. Our aim is to strive for, achieve and maintain an “A” rated school grade.

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
Roberts, Regina	Assistant Principal	
Oge, Alex	Assistant Principal	
Monroe, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Wile, Erik	Assistant Principal	
Emerson, Jean	Assistant Principal	
Lehman, Bradley	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.

Stakeholder involvement and SIP development is collected by way of a survey where our families can provide input electronically. Additionally, our Needs Assessment was provided to our School Advisory Council where they were afforded the opportunity to provide feedback.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our SIP goals are monitored on a monthly basis, upon continuous data review of all measurements.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) 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: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1349
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	285
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	623
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	478
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	678

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1151

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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										1	1
One or more suspensions											0
Course failure in ELA										1	1
Course failure in Math											0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment										1	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment											0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.										1	1

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	49	43	50	53	46	51	51		
ELA Learning Gains				56			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			40		
Math Achievement*	25	22	38	41	37	38	29		
Math Learning Gains				56			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			34		
Science Achievement*	69	61	64	61	29	40	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	66	60	66	68	43	48	63		
Middle School Acceleration					46	44			
Graduation Rate	97	91	89	99	58	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	67	70	65	78	60	67	82		
ELP Progress	40	40	45	47			43		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	666
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	99

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	55			
HSP	58			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	56			

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	41			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	57			
HSP	62			

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	63			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	57			

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	49			25			69	66		97	67	40
SWD	21			14			43	33		19	6	
ELL	16			14			62	32		67	7	40
AMI												
ASN	62			64			100	86		73	6	
BLK	45			22			59	62		61	7	36
HSP	47			20			72	64		68	7	42
MUL	56			20			76	70		69	6	
PAC												
WHT	55			37			75	71		71	6	
FRL	46			22			67	62		61	7	39

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	53	56	43	41	56	64	61	68		99	78	47
SWD	19	33	35	17	43	46	23	37		99	53	
ELL	17	40	44	24	49	62	38	52		100	67	47
AMI												
ASN	69	71		73			93			100	91	

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	54	44	31	53	66	55	64		99	76	39
HSP	54	56	47	43	56	63	63	70		99	83	50
MUL	56	53		50	68		53	47		100	78	
PAC												
WHT	57	56	38	48	59	58	64	73		98	74	
FRL	47	55	46	33	53	64	56	61		99	75	39

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	51	49	40	29	32	34	67	63		100	82	43
SWD	15	35	41	15	28	40	45	42		100	47	
ELL	24	36	35	21	32	48	49	57		98	85	43
AMI												
ASN	68	48		33	23		70	83		100	100	
BLK	44	48	43	20	23	23	57	60		100	78	43
HSP	55	50	39	31	36	37	70	62		100	86	45
MUL	43	44	33	31	37	60	70	30		100	66	
PAC												
WHT	54	49	38	38	40	42	74	71		99	84	
FRL	44	45	41	24	28	30	61	58		99	80	45

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
10	2023 - Spring	51%	48%	3%	50%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	45%	42%	3%	48%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	34%	-15%	50%	-31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	39%	-6%	48%	-15%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	63%	4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	63%	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.

When compared to the school grade components of 2022, Treasure Coast High School Increased in several reporting categories for 2023 including Biology and US History. We saw decreases in our ELA and Math proficiency, as a result of the new BEST standards and FAST Progress Monitoring assessments/End-of-Course Exams. Our Students with Disabilities remained stagnate for 2023 in the areas of proficiency, however we kept above the federal index of 41%.

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

Based off progress monitoring and the 2023 state assessment results, the greatest need for improvement is in the area of Math. Specifically, we saw a 19% proficiency rate for students taking the FAST Algebra 1 assessment in 2023. We also saw 33% proficiency rate for students in Geometry. A secondary need based on decline was in the area of ELA. We saw a drop in proficiency from 53% in 2022 to 48% last school 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.

The largest gaps that were seen in ELA and Math from the previous school year.

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

We saw the most improvement on the Biology End-of-Course exam, growing from 61% to 70%. Some of the new actions taken were classroom and school-wide incentives related to the Unit Assessment scores, weekly use of and monitoring of PENDA, and strategic scheduling of identified students with experienced teachers.

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

Factors that may have contributed to the improvement: strategic scheduling, Thinking Classroom Model, standards-based grading, the CLP process, and the use of a math interventionist. Some of the new actions taken that might have contributed to this improvement was school-wide professional development with the Thinking Classroom Model and standards-based grading.

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

Growth in Math proficiency, with a focus on learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25%
Growth in ELA proficiency, with a focus on learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25%
Growth in Acceleration enrollment and future-focused opportunities
Continued growth of positive culture and climate among teachers, staff, and students to maximize instructional time

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

ELA proficiency for 9th and 10 grade students was defined as an area of focus for our district and school. Our overall proficiency of 48% in 9th and 10th Grade was indicative of the new assessment. Our 9th grade ELA proficiency for 2023 was 44% and the 10th grade ELA proficiency was 51%. We also plan on focusing on learning gains and our bottom quartile students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall ELA proficiency for 9th and 10th grade achievement goal is 50%

Monitoring:

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

The CLP process and progress monitoring with Power Bi and Performance Matters. In addition, data chats and identified at risk students meeting will be held on a consistent basis, with teacher observations and continuous feedback

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

A school-wide approach for planning and implementing best practices for instruction will be adopted. The CLP model will be followed with fidelity across instructional areas. This process is supported in both ELA and Reading classrooms by our Literacy Coach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To provide a blueprint for planning for creating fluid instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits all solution but rather dynamic approaches that can be customized and adjusted to meet the needs of the individual. The CLP process suggests that proper implementation increase student achievement and promotes teacher collaboration.

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.

Teachers have been exposed to Standards-Based grading philosophies, the CLP process, and the BEST standards. Warning signs will be identified and traced using key data points using Unit Assessment data, Progress Monitoring data, and Performance Matters. Focus will remain on celebrations and incentives within the classroom to promote achievement and gains.

Person Responsible: Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Following each Unit Assessment and Progress Monitoring window

Feedback to parents regarding ELA performance relative to the FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 assessments, in addition to Unit Assessment scores. This will be done through multiple communication platforms including social media and Skyward.

Person Responsible: Regina Roberts (regina.roberts@stlucieschools.org)

By When: January-February, following Progress Monitoring 2 window.

Teacher-student data chats to be completed following each Unit Assessment and FAST Progress Monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible: Regina Roberts (regina.roberts@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.

Math proficiency for Algebra and Geometry students was defined as an area of focus for our district and school. Our overall proficiency of 19% in Algebra and 33% in Geometry was indicative of the new assessment. We also plan on focusing on learning gains and our bottom quartile students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall proficiency goal is 45%, with Algebra proficiency goal is 40% and Geometry proficiency goal is 50%.

Monitoring:

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

The CLP process and progress monitoring with Power Bi and Performance Matters. In addition, data chats and identified at risk students meeting will be held on a consistent basis, with teacher observations and continuous feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

A school-wide approach for planning and implementing best practices for instruction will be adopted. The CLP model will be followed with fidelity across instructional areas. Both Algebra and Geometry teachers are supported through the CLP process by our Math Coach on a weekly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To provide a blueprint for planning for creating fluid instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits all solution but rather dynamic approaches that can be customized and adjusted to meet the needs of the individual. The CLP process suggests that proper implementation increase student achievement and promotes teacher collaboration.

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.

Teachers have been exposed to Standards-Based grading philosophies, flipped classroom, the CLP process, and the BEST Math standards. Warning signs will be identified and traced using key data points using Unit Assessment data, Progress Monitoring data, and Performance Matters. Focus will remain on celebrations and incentives within the classroom to promote achievement and gains.

Person Responsible: Erik Wile (eik.wile@stlucieschools.org)

By When: On-going

Teacher-student data chats to be completed following each district test.

Person Responsible: Erik Wile (eik.wile@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Following each district test

Mid-Year/End-of-Year Boot Camps

Person Responsible: Erik Wile (eik.wile@stlucieschools.org)

By When: January and April

FEV Tutor groups as extra educational opportunity through Electives- L25 students identified

Person Responsible: Erik Wile (eik.wile@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Beginning September 5th through February

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**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.

Our current Acceleration rate is approaching 70% for the 2023-2024 calendar school year. This data is a lagging indicator. The need in this area is to increase the Acceleration rate to 80% or above and provide increased work ready, industry certifications for our student after graduation. In addition, we want to expand some of our attractor programs and target specific students that match our CTE course pathways leading to increase student achievement in CTE and push their educational experience. Our commitment to providing future-focused opportunities remains aligned with our mission and vision.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall Acceleration rate of 80% or above for the 2024 grad cohort.

Monitoring:

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

Power Bi, Excel, and monthly data reviews with CTE teachers will be used to monitor the progression of certification attempts, enrollment in a CTE course, and certification progress. Dual enrollment and AICE student will be monitor and strategically scheduled based on what is best for the students to be academically successful.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

A school-wide CTE monitoring approach for student success for industry certifications and work ready skills to promote student opportunities post high school approach. Resource allocation will be implementation to support the teachers, students, and general community partnerships that will produce students for work ready areas for current industry demands.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our industry certifications are a critical part of our student growth, opens opportunities for work ready jobs, and to continues further educate students in their area of interest as they continue through the educational experience. We schedule students in dual enrollment and AICE courses to meet their academic needs and push the student rigor for success. This is demonstrates our future-focused approach for all students. In addition, we foster community partnerships that promote student experiences, opportunities to gain career insight, and experiences from professionals in the fields they represent while pushing the students to excel personally and academically. We remained focused on program "completers" in each of our CTE academies.

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.

Bi-weekly monitoring of each grad cohort to assist with ensuring new students are scheduled upon entry with Guidance Director Sommer.

Person Responsible: Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Bi-weekly

Monthly CTE department meetings to determine program needs and development of a testing schedule for industry certifications

Person Responsible: Jason Monroe (jason.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Bi-weekly Acceleration Progression meetings with CTE teachers to review student progress and success within our courses/programs.

Person Responsible: Jason Monroe (jason.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Bi-weekly, starting in August

#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.

We want Treasure Coast High School to continue as the highest performing high school in St. Lucie County. To accomplish this goal, we have to maximize time to provide quality instruction. One of the ways we are losing valuable time is through timely transitions between classes and time spent out of class. We also lose time when we have students change out of non-dress code clothing, or when we address the use of cell phones/related devices. For these reasons, we are going to focus on having as much instructional time as possible by limiting these distractions. An increase in instructional time also will result in increased teacher effectiveness and climate. We also believe in recognizing our teachers and staff on a monthly basis and throughout the school year to reinforce their impact on student learning and achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the 3rd 9 weeks, we anticipate a reduction in Level 1-Level 4 offenses as a result of single school focus and messaging.

We anticipate an increase in student and teacher Climate Survey results in November and April.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data will be monitored and reviewed monthly by Administration, the Dean team, and Behavior Specialist.

Opportunities for feedback from teachers and staff provided monthly through Faculty Council, Leadership Team meetings, and Tea-Time with Administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@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.)

Use of Single School Expectations presentation/scripts at key points throughout the school year.

Communication of expectations to parents and students through multiple School

Messenger call-outs, Parent Nights, and class assemblies.

Multiple opportunities for teacher/staff incentives and feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When clear expectations and single messaging are aligned, academics, behaviors, and climate impact student learning and achievement.

Single School Culture also assists with teacher retention as a result of supportive practices.

Communication with all stakeholders assists with student accountability.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Monthly availability for building problem solving through Faculty Council, Leadership Team, and Tea-Time with Administration

Person Responsible: Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Review of Single School Culture scripts at strategic points throughout the school year

Person Responsible: Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

Monthly Teacher/Staff Titan of the Month through Faculty Meetings

Person Responsible: Bradley Lehman (bradley.lehman@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

Our SIP is shared with our stakeholders through a survey, at our School Advisory Council meetings, and on our school website.

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))

TCHS is planning for family engagement opportunities once a quarter. Our first meeting planned is 9/6/23 for our Senior students and families. We leverage communication platforms to disseminate information to our students and families on a weekly basis.

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 plan to strengthen our areas of focus is communication with our teachers, support by our coaches and teachers leaders, and continuous monitoring of identified metrics, relative to our established goals.

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))

We work closely with our district nutrition program and CTE department to ensure that we are maximize our resources to support our students.

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))

At TCHS, we support the whole-child through providing school counseling as needed. We also have a full-time Mental Health Counselor and a DATA counselor to better address specific concerns through a prescriptive approach for each student. Our Titan Ambassadors student group is active in mentoring of not only other TCHS students, but elementary and middle school-aged students in our community. We also partner with Project Search for our ESE students to provide them workforce skills and experiences in our school, in addition to in the community.

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))

At TCHS, we are dedicated to exposing all students to future-focused opportunities throughout their high school experience. This includes but is not limited to AICE coursework, AP coursework, Dual Enrollment courses (both on campus and off), and CTE courses/programs. These programs include our Academy of Industrial Biotechnology, Academy of Criminal Justice, Academy of Culinary Arts, Digital Art and Imaging, Academy of Advanced Manufacturing, Academy of Health Science, Academy of International Business, Global Logistics and Supply Chain technology, and JROTC.

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).

We have budgeted for a Behavior Specialist through Title 1 funds that will assist us with prevention and proactive measures addressing student problem behavior. Through our district's iSucceed model, we are

hosting parent meetings and monitoring at-risk students on a weekly basis to problem solve and best meet their needs to ensure our mission of graduation.

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 Professional Learning plan is aligned with district and school initiatives and priorities. We also value teacher and personnel input and choice. Our first Professional Learning day in September will be determined by teacher input and need.

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))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes