

St. Lucie Public Schools

Frances K. Sweet Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Frances K. Sweet Elementary School

1400 AVENUE Q, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

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.

F. K. Sweet is a traditional academic magnet school that maintains excellence by establishing positive partnerships between school, home and community. We take pride in providing all students with the opportunities for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Frances K. Sweet is a community of students, parents, and staff dedicated to the development of every individual's desire to learn and achieve success. Collectively, we provide a safe and caring environment that fosters a life-long passion for 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
Brome , Makeda	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Monitor Instruction - Support Collaborative Planning - Monitor Achievement Data - Monitor Student Attendance - Conduct Classroom Walk-throughs, Informal, and Formal Observations - Ensure that the campus is SAFE - Lead and manage all school operations - Recruit, orient, train, coach, counsel, and support all staff - Set high expectations and standards for the academic and social development of all students. - Utilize data to monitor student achievement aligned to academic standards - Ensure that staff and students are provided with a positive learning culture - Guide and support the implementation of schoolwide PBIS
Lewis, Margaret	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitor Instruction - Support Collaborative Planning - Monitor Achievement Data - Monitor Student Attendance - Conduct Classroom Walk-throughs, Informal, and Formal Observations - Ensure that the campus is SAFE - Facilitate professional development of the instructional staff utilizing assessment data and other performance measures - Ensure professional development strategies are aligned and targeted to meet the needs of students in programs. - Ensure a safe and secure learning environment through the systematic implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Supports and other appropriate preventive strategies.
Richardson, Ramona	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach provides professional development and support to teachers with the BEST standards for reading and writing curriculum. The instructional coach helps facilitate CLPs as grade level teams work collaboratively to design lessons that are rigorous, engaging, and standards-based. The coach also provides support in the classroom by modeling, co-teaching, implementing coaching cycles, and helping with classroom management. The coach also analyzes school, district, and state data to inform instructional decisions and organize small groups to maximize student learning and growth.</p>
Morales- Lopez, Rachel	Math Coach	<p>The instructional coach provides professional development and support to teachers with the BEST standards for math and science. The instructional coach helps facilitate CLPs as grade level teams work collaboratively to design lessons that are rigorous, engaging, and standards-based. The coach also provides support in the classroom by modeling, co-teaching,</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		implementing coaching cycles, and helping with classroom management. The coach also analyzes school, district, and state data to inform instructional decisions and organize small groups to maximize student learning and growth.

Adams,
Miesha

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The principal disaggregated the 2022-2023 school year BEST data. That data was then shared with the school leadership team, grade-level team members, staff, community partners, and the parent teacher organization. Themes from all stakeholders centered around improving the proficiency and learning gains of the bottom quartile and adding additional supports for students scoring Level 4 or 5 on state assessments so they do not fall out of proficiency and at least maintain their current level for the 2023-2024 school year.

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))

The SIP will be monitored on a monthly basis to track the schools progress towards the goals. As district and state assessments (PM1 and PM2) are given, the test data which is being used a predictor of proficiency for PM3, will be used to predict the current proficiency. If the school is not meeting progress toward the SIP goals, the student data will be analyzed to see in which areas that the data is not improving or increasing and the SIP will be revised to meet those original goals. Support using supplemental resources, strategic small groups, or instructional coaching will be implemented to support student achievement towards the SiP goals.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	86%

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

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	9	14	14	10	9	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	5	6	7	0	0	0	26
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	7	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	15	5	3	31	13	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	14	16	16	22	18	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	12	17	17	27	28	0	0	0	110

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	18	16	18	29	23	0	0	0	104

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	10	19	14	8	21	19	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	8	5	5	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	25	28	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	23	40	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	13	10	3	0	0	0	27

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	1	0	13	23	32	0	0	0	69

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	10	19	14	8	21	19	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	8	5	5	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	25	28	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	23	40	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	13	10	3	0	0	0	27

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	1	0	13	23	32	0	0	0	69

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44	44	53	42	46	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				63			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			41		
Math Achievement*	46	52	59	47	43	50	28		
Math Learning Gains				61			16		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			5		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	47	49	54	33	50	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	58	59	70			62		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	250
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	7	Yes	1	1
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	65			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	57			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	64			
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	44			46			47					69
SWD	7			14			0				3	
ELL	50			63							4	69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			37			38				5	54
HSP	57			65			70				5	74
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80			70							2	
FRL	41			44			47				5	75

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	42	63	59	47	61	58	33					70
SWD	23	68	70	27	47		20					
ELL	50	71		57	53							70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	63	62	40	58	59	28					71
HSP	53	61		63	68		33					65
MUL	60			70								
PAC												
WHT	67			60								
FRL	36	58	60	44	58	53	26					71

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	41	54	41	28	16	5	40					62
SWD	17	47	45	11	12	9	13					
ELL	31	69		13	0		50					62

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	54	50	24	14	6	29					47
HSP	46	63		30	19		67					70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	50		56	30		60					
FRL	36	54	41	25	16	5	35					66

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	44%	46%	-2%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	42%	-2%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	52%	-3%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	56%	-8%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	48%	5%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	51%	-5%

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.

Third grade overall showed the lowest performance in ELA and Math. When looking specifically at ELA proficiency, 3rd grade reading proficiency declined 53% to 40% (-13%), and 3rd Grade math proficiency declined from 53% to 49% (-4%).

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

Third grade ELA proficiency had the greatest decline of 13% proficiency. Some factors that contributed to this was a focus on proficiency because of the states grading system for the 2021-2022 school year. Additionally, teachers struggled with teaching to the intent of the standard and analyzing data to see which benchmarks should be targeted to improve student learning and proficiency.

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.

While learning gains for all students and bottom quartile students were not calculated for the 2022-2023 school year, internal school calculations showed that learning gains for bottom quartile students would have declined from 59% to 10% (-49% point drop) in ELA, and from 58% to 19% (39% point drop) in Math. The factor that contributed towards this decline was the new state model that only focused on proficiency the first year. Resources and support was geared towards maintaining the proficiency of currently proficient students and students on the cusp of being proficient.

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

While proficiency in all areas for the school increased from the previous year for accountable cells, which was ELA proficiency (42% to 46%), Math proficiency (47% to 50%), 5th Grade science showed the most improvement with an increase from 33% proficiency to 46% proficiency, an overall increase of 13% points from the previous year. The school utilized support from the district science curriculum department. The district support helped with science collaborative planning and with creating and implementing strategic science crunch time tutoring before the state science test.

When looking at specific grade level.

5th Grade Math also showed significant improvement with proficiency increasing from 31% to 53%. This increase was prompted by a focus on the new benchmarks and teaching to the intent of the benchmarks. CLPs focused on looking at which benchmarks students scored the lowest on and creating small groups to target the weakest benchmarks.

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

1. 3rd Grade ELA
2. Learning Gains of bottom quartile

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

- 1) Third Grade ELA proficiency
- 2) Learning gains of the bottom quartile
- 3) Science

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 Small Group Instruction**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.

When analyzing data, it was revealed that the bottom quartile students showed the least proficiency and growth across all grade levels on the PM3 Statewide ELA and Math Assessments. Bottom quartile learning gains dropped 49% percentage points in ELA, and 39% percentage points in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Goal is that at least 60% of bottom quartile students make learning gains in ELA and Math when looking at schoolwide data.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress towards learning gains will be monitored by looking at growth between district assessments, iReady Standards Masteries, and PM1 to PM2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Makeda Brome (makeda.brome@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.)

Small group instruction will be the major intervention for bottom quartile students. Teachers will use MTSS and small group instruction to target deficit skills for students identified in the bottom quartile.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction during MTSS and in the content block allows staff to help groups of students with their specific learning gaps. Through a data analysis of state testing data, specific skills or benchmarks can be targeted for teaching, reteaching, or intervention. Small group instruction also allows students to still learn grade level material during whole group while addressing their areas that need 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.

Analyze PM3 data to organize students into small groups. Identify the key skills that bottom quartile students need to be taught or remediated on and create a schedule of small group instruction for 3rd-5th bottom quartile students

Person Responsible: Ramona Richardson (denise.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 15

Train teachers on best practices for small group instruction and interventions. Identify the materials teachers will use during small group instruction

Person Responsible: Rachel Morales-Lopez (rachel.morales-lopez@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 15

Monitor student growth/learning gains from PM1 to PM2. Update small groups as needed based on the data

Person Responsible: Makeda Brome (makeda.brome@stlucieschools.org)

By When: January 18

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The iReady, District assessments, and PM3 data showed that we have over 50% of students performing below grade level in ELA and Math. Admin and instructional coaches will work collaboratively with teachers to deepen their understanding of the BEST benchmarks and design lessons, activities, and tasks aligned to the BEST benchmarks. When lessons are aligned to the BEST benchmarks, then we can expect students to master grade level content.

Because third grade showed the most decline in proficiency, admin will attend all CLP sessions for third grade as a support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 60% of students will score on grade level as evidenced by proficiency on the PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Student performance on the iReady Diagnostics, FAST PM1 and PM2 will be monitored to track performance towards the goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Margaret Lewis (margaret.lewis@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.)

We will implement collaborative planning protocols to ensure that the planning talks about not just about the "what" is being learned but "how" content will be taught, "what" will happen if students do not learn it, and "how" do we enrich students who are proficient.

This model follows Richard DuFour's PLC questions:

1. What is it we want our student to learn?
2. How will we know if each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some students do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The BEST benchmarks are in their third year of implementation, but the math and ELA curriculum are still relatively new to teachers. Collaborative planning allows teachers to not only understand the benchmarks better, but also understand how the curriculum aligns to the benchmarks. During this time teachers will also be able to identify the best instructional strategies, materials, resources, and website that will support full alignment to the benchmarks.

The better teachers understand the benchmarks and how the curriculum supports learning of the benchmarks, the better students will understand the subject matter.

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.

Establish CLP protocols, norms, meeting times. Instructional Coaches and Teacher Leaders will also facilitate collaborative planning and support teachers as they select resources aligned to standards.

Person Responsible: Ramona Richardson (denise.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August 15

Monitor CLP effectiveness by looking at student performance on district and state assessments

Person Responsible: Makeda Brome (makeda.brome@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 15, and ongoing as students are tested

Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to see if lesson plans are being implemented with fidelity

Person Responsible: Makeda Brome (makeda.brome@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 1st and Ongoing

Coaches develop coaching plans for teacher based on walkthrough evidence

Person Responsible: Rachel Morales-Lopez (rachel.morales-lopez@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

We had 26 students who missed 20 or more days of school last year. Due to this loss of instruction, all students on the list did not perform proficient on their ELA or Math FAST PM3 assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like our daily attendance rate to be at least 95%. Additionally, we would like our chronic absenteeism to drop by 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly attendance meetings will be held with admin, school counselor, and school social worker to see if attendance is increasing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Margaret Lewis (margaret.lewis@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.)

Establish a "Glad you are here club" for students with the counselor to meet with identified students weekly to establish strong relationships and help problem-solve reasons for being absent. Incentives will be established for students who meet attendance goals for the week. Use social worker to provide visits to students when they are absent more than 5 consecutive days.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The club allows student to build positive relationships with staff and school counselor. When student build a strong relationship with a caring adult at school, they are more likely to attend school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Identify chronically absent students

Person Responsible: Makeda Brome (makeda.brome@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August 10 from previous year, Track monthly for new students with absences

Establish "Glad You're Here Club" that includes attendance goals and incentives for students being at school

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: By school counselor (Darryl Wilson) September 1

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

According to the Spring 2023 PM3

Kindergarten - 50% of students scored below the 40th percentile

Grade 1 - 47% of students scored below the 40th percentile

Grade 2 - 33% of students scored below the 40th percentile

In Grades K-2 it is important to focus on the foundations of reading and for teachers to have a deep understanding of the progression of the foundation benchmarks. When collaboratively planning we must provide opportunities for students to enhance their print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word analysis.

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

According to the Spring 2023 PM3

3rd Grade- 57% of students scored below a Level 3

4th Grade- 49% of students scored below a Level 3

5th Grade- 59% of students scored below a Level 3

Grades 3-5 teachers will provide foundational reading skills instruction targeting decoding and encoding skills to reduce by 50% the number of students scoring in Profile Group 1 as measured by iReady reading diagnostics

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

90% of K-2 students will master grade level phonics including letter names, sounds and CVC words.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Reduce the number of students in grades 3-5 identified with phonics and vocabulary deficits. 55% of students will score a level three or higher in grades 3-5 on the ELA PM3

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.

Monitor students scoring in i-Ready Reading Instructional Profile Groupings 1 and 2.
Monitor Star and FAST Progressing Monitoring Data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brome , Makeda, makeda.brome@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?

Ensure effective implementation of the Benchmark Advance core ELA curriculum.

Utilize CLPs to plan Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 reading instruction.

Schedule and Interventionist and ESE Support Facilitation teachers to provide supplemental reading instruction to Tier 3 students.
 Reading coaches will monitor, support, and enhance classroom instruction through CLPs and coaching cycles.

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?

Research outlined by What Works Clearinghouse <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/3> supports the use of universal screeners and progress monitoring such as Renaissance STAR, FAST, and i-Ready Reading Diagnostics to target small group and individualized instruction in foundational reading skills

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
The Literacy Leadership Team will implement a weekly classroom walkthrough schedule utilizing the Literacy Walkthrough Tool to provide feedback and targeted supports	Lewis, Margaret, margaret.lewis@stlucieschools.org
Literacy Coaching: The Reading Coach will co-lead CLPs, conduct walkthroughs, provide professional development, and provide coaching cycles to improve reading instruction.	Richardson, Ramona, denise.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org
Assessment: ELA teachers will utilize daily, weekly, and unit assessments to monitor student progress toward mastery of standards. Weekly data CLPs will be utilized to review data to make instructional shifts.	Brome , Makeda, makeda.brome@stlucieschools.org
Professional Learning: Daily CLPs are utilized to plan for ELA and writing instruction two days per week. Early release days will be utilized to provide professional development in core and supplemental ELA curriculum.	Richardson, Ramona, denise.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

The SIP will be available on the school's website for stakeholders to access at anytime. Additionally, the SIP will be shared at the September SAC and PTO meetings. It will also be shared at the October Title 1 Family night. Copies of the school's goals will be sent home with students in their home language.

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

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school plans on re-establishing the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and the School Advisory Committee (SAC). By recruiting parents/guardians to both organizations, the school can share the vision of the school and receive input on how students needs are being supported and in what ways meeting students needs can be improved. In addition, the school will host 4 family nights (one each quarter) targeting parents/guardians of students. These events will serve to inform parents student progress and how they can help their student be successful in each class by learning skills such as logging into the Skyward Family Access, reading to their student, practicing math facts, talking with students about their testing data, and etc..

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

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

The school plans to strengthen the academic programs in the school by (1) utilizing the schools MTSS time to provided strategic interventions to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, additionally other students will be grouped and walk to intervention. Each group will target the skills/benchmarks students are weak at. (2) Students scoring above grade level will receive targeted enrichment in ELA and Math provided by the Gifted Teacher. Additionally, supplemental curriculum (iReady, Top Score, Acaletics) has been purchased to help support small group learning, writing, and spiral review in classes.

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))

N/A

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))

The school counselor provides one-on-one and group counseling for student to learn social skills. Our district mental health counselor offers the same type of counseling as well, in addition to helping students with coping skills for behaviors. We also have a school social worker who provides specialized support services to students and their families to help decrease barriers to student well-being and success at the school.

The school also has a program called "Guys with Ties" which mentors young males and helps them learn social skills that will make them productive citizens.

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))

n/a

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 PBIS. PBIS serves as a way to reward students who are meeting the schools behavior expectations. At FK Sweet our acronym is S.T.A.R. which stands for

- Stay Safe
- Take Responsibility
- Always be Engaged
- Respect others

Students receive class dojo points for meeting these expectations and then can use those points to attend special events or receive incentives.

Students with a lot of behavior issues as evidenced by behavior incident reports or referrals are put into a program called iSucceed. The purpose of the program is to work with students and parents to decrease the number of behavior incident reports and referrals by paring them with a staff mentor, utilizing check in/check out, and offering incentives for decrease in 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))

Data chats are held on a weekly basis to discuss student data on iReady, District Assessments, and FAST PM assessments. Paraprofessionals, ESE teachers, resource teachers, classroom teachers, administration, and counselors attend these meetings. Students who are not improving or reaching academic goals are discussed and plans are created to support students in their deficiencies. MTSS interventions are also used for students to walk to intervention and all staff participate in MTSS.

Recruiting and retaining effective teachers is done through attending job fairs, recruiting online through Indeed, and using the schools website and facebook page to market the school.

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 have a kindergarten kickoff program. The purpose of the program is to provide preschoolers transitioning to the school as kindergarteners a chance to experience a day of kindergarten, be screened for current academic levels, and inform parents of what to expect of their schooling and education at FK Sweet. During kindergarten kickoff students participate in and transition through a normal day's schedule which includes eating lunch and breakfast. Parents/guardians are provided with math manipulatives and sound/letter/word tools to help their student at home.