

St. Lucie Public Schools

Lincoln Park Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Lincoln Park Academy

1806 AVENUE I, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

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 Lincoln Park Academy is to ensure that all students graduate from our safe and caring school, and are equipped with knowledge, academic skills and the desire to succeed as life long learners and positive contributors to our diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lincoln Park Academy will be a premier college preparatory secondary school that prepares all students for post-secondary placement through challenging, engaging, and satisfying work that enables every student to continuously improve in all academic areas. Teachers will work together collaboratively as part of a dynamic community engaged in learning and designing quality work for students. The curriculum will require annual mastery of the core academics and will provide elective subjects to enhance student development. A partnership will exist with parents and the community, that fosters citizenship, self-reliance, and character development.

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
Herrington, Michelle	Principal	
Stone, Candace	Assistant Principal	
Octavi, Lynda	Assistant Principal	
Cobb, Kyle	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

LPA Leadership Team met to create SIP
LPA shared SIP with SAC / members for ratification
LPA shared SIP during faculty meeting

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))

LPA Leadership will review SIP goals progress after diagnostic and PM state assessments.
LPA will make necessary adjustments with student schedules and CLPs.

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 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	60%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	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	

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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	68	54	403	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	31	19	131	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	16	103	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	40	104	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	55	49	208	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	70	65	283	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	40	40	139	

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	82	74	71	343

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	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	68	54	173	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	31	19	91	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	16	46	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	40	61	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	55	49	160	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	70	65	215	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	40	40	128	

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	82	74	71	227

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*	55	43	50	67	46	51	66		
ELA Learning Gains				60			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			36		
Math Achievement*	42	22	38	55	37	38	52		
Math Learning Gains				52			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			27		
Science Achievement*	69	61	64	70	29	40	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	60	66	78	43	48	76		
Middle School Acceleration	76			83	46	44	77		
Graduation Rate	100	91	89	100	58	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	70	70	65	80	60	67	88		
ELP Progress	24	40	45	35			46		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	508
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	772
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

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	31	Yes	2	2
ELL	26	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	55			
HSP	65			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	57			

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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	59			
HSP	63			

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	80			
PAC				
WHT	74			
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	55			42			69	72	76	100	70	24
SWD	17			16			30	33		18	7	6
ELL	27			20			22	39			5	24
AMI												
ASN	83			77			95	76		100	6	
BLK	42			31			62	61	77	58	8	8
HSP	58			45			62	76	82	67	8	30
MUL	70			67				69			3	
PAC												
WHT	65			52			77	83	65	74	7	
FRL	45			34			60	65	72	56	8	26

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	67	60	48	55	52	44	70	78	83	100	80	35
SWD	27	34	27	21	32	24	29	43				29
ELL	41	47	37	30	43	39	31	41				35
AMI												
ASN	88	81		83	69		94	100	100	100	100	

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	54	55	47	40	48	44	51	74	77	100	71	43
HSP	72	59	44	54	48	36	74	72	78	100	84	35
MUL	74	61		79	71		67	92	93	100	83	
PAC												
WHT	75	65	60	68	57	55	81	85	85	100	78	
FRL	57	53	41	42	47	39	58	68	78	100	76	29

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	66	57	36	52	33	27	67	76	77	100	88	46
SWD	29	37	29	24	26	17	40	38		100	75	29
ELL	30	31	17	26	23	22	25	29				46
AMI												
ASN	91	73		89	58		95	95	87	100	100	
BLK	56	53	36	38	27	25	54	64	77	100	82	46
HSP	66	54	27	51	30	25	59	76	64	98	91	45
MUL	87	63		69	34		80	75	100			
PAC												
WHT	72	60	40	63	37	30	80	82	80	100	88	
FRL	60	52	34	43	31	26	59	68	71	100	81	42

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	70%	48%	22%	50%	20%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	43%	6%	47%	2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	55%	43%	12%	47%	8%
09	2023 - Spring	56%	42%	14%	48%	8%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	42%	5%	47%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	48%	-11%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	18%	38%	-20%	48%	-30%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	43%	5%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	61%	41%	20%	44%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	34%	11%	50%	-5%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	39%	26%	48%	17%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	63%	17%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	61%	0%	66%	-5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	59%	28%	63%	24%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Math. We recognize a need to continue to strengthen our CLP processes to improve standards-based instruction reduce variance among classes, and use data to drive instruction.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in both Math and ELA. We recognize a need to continue to strengthen our CLP processes to improve standards-based instruction reduce variance among classes, and use data to drive instruction.

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 contributing factors for this need for improvement was the transition back to brick and mortar education and new ELA Curriculum for the district. Our action to address this need for improvement is a focus on curriculum instruction through Professional Learning and Collaborative Learning and Planning with TSA. In addition, the reading teachers will work closely with our Tier 3 students to increase learning gains by using MyPath and IXL. In math, we will use MyPath to support students on their pathway to increase their level and achieve learning gains. We will further use that data to provide small group support.

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

Science scores in Middle School and High School continuously outperformed district and state scores. The consistent actions that are taken are: teachers looping from different grade levels to ensure that the students are being taught by the instructor who is the most familiar with the subject matter and bootcamps.

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

Discipline
ELA & Math Proficiency

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

The priorities for the 2023.2024 school year are:

- (1) Improve the overall proficiency Math
- (2) Improve the overall proficiency ELA
- (3) Discipline

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Collaborative Planning - ELA & Math. We recognize the need to strengthen our CLP processes to ensure rigorous standards-based instruction are planned for and delivered, to reduce the variance in instruction and student achievement among classes, and to use data to drive instruction. During the planning process specific strategies are agreed up to ensure that the performance SWD and ELL subgroups improve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to increase the proficiency in the targeted subgroups (SWD, ELL) above 41%.

Our goal is to strength collaborative planning in the Middle School in Math and ELA thereby improving proficiency in ELA and math.

Monitoring:

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

- Attendance
- Planning Docs
- Test Scores
- PM Scores
- Unit Assessments
- District Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynda Octavi (lynda.octavi@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.)

- TSA is assigned to attend all Middle School ELA and Math collaborative planning meetings to provide support and guidance.
- Master schedule with common planning times for all subjects.
- Utilize resources withing Savaas materials to increase literacy instruction
- Use resources - Support Facilitator and ESOL district support

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will provide a in-depth lense of the collaborative planning process from beginning to end.

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.

CLP Schedule - teachers meet weekly with the TSA and admin to develop a quality plans

Person Responsible: Candace Stone (candace.stone@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August - June 2023

ESE Support Specialist to assist with planning

Person Responsible: Lynda Octavi (lynda.octavi@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August - June 2023

ESOL support from Office of Teacher and Learning

Person Responsible: Kyle Cobb (kyle.cobb@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August - June 2023

#2. 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.

The school works at building positive relationships with families through the many opportunities for parental

involvement, including academic, athletic, social, and performances. Parents are contacted regarding specific student conduct, student achievements, as well as ongoing communication about student progress.

Parents are also encouraged to participate in parent groups which are actively involved in the school. We will also capitalize on building a positive school culture and environment through implementation of single school culture, the new iSucceed Classroom Management initiative, maintaining a focus on the social, emotional and well-being of our students and staff, while maintaining a "Student-Centered" approach.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall, all faculty and staff are stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment. Specifically, the PBIS Team is tasked with identifying ways to increase the culture and environment at the school. In addition, those teachers who facilitate SEL also have a prominent role in this. Finally, the School Advisory Council (SAC), plays in critical role by supporting the school's high expectations and providing input in key.

areas such as student achievement. We will be looking for a 5% increase on our overall climate survey rating.

Monitoring:

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

We will be looking for an improvement on our teacher / staff climate survey put out by the district..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Candace Stone (candace.stone@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 are re-focusing teacher and staff leaders, birthdays, and team building and bonding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By increasing the number of positive exchanges and interactions between employees and directed to employees, we believe we will have happier employees.

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.

New Mascot - Lincoln Parker - increase school spirit

Person Responsible: Michelle Herrington (michelle.herrington@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August - September 2023

Top Dog

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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).

SAC

PTA

Partnership with district Administrator on Special Assignment overseeing grants

Work with district curriculum department to fund approved resources

Partner with Federal and Special Programs Manager for Title 1 to plan budgets

Partner with Coordinator for Title 1 to plan parent involvement events and resources.

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

NA

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.

NA

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?

NA

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?

NA

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**

NA

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.

A links to our SIP and data demonstrating our progress will be on our school webpage. A presentation summarizing our SIP and progress throughout the year will be provided to parents as part of our initial Title 1 presentation in conjunction with Curriculum night. The same plan will be used to share and disseminated information to the community through SAC beginning in August.

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))

Communication regarding our events and will be on school webpage and pushed out through our school's social media. Additionally, at every event, beginning with Open House, families will receive information about how to join our SAC. Our goal is to increase family participation and build learning partnerships with our school families. Additionally, each teacher and staff member is committed to supporting the needs of our students.

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))

Content and Academic support in Elective Classes

STEM integration, particularly technology to increase student engagement and track progress

Grade level and Vertical (across grade levels) collaborative planning regrading content standard, best practices, strategies to maximize instruction

Provide professional learning to teachers and staff, followed by support from TSA as needed, focusing on academic areas of need, such as math and ELA small groups.

Learning Walks- Teachers are able to observe their peers implementing different instructional strategies

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

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	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.

No