St. Lucie Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

St. Lucie Elementary School

2020 S 13TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

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.

Saint Lucie Elementary
Mission Statement

The mission of Saint Lucie Elementary School is to ensure every child succeeds academically, behaviorally, and socially in a safe and secure environment. We provide students with engaging learning experiences to nurture lifelong learners resulting in high levels of academic achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Lucie Elementary
Vision Statement

St. Lucie Elementary will be a student support system designated to create and maintain a prolific learning environment. Each learner will have access to the resources needed to utilize technology and educational materials in an informational society. The infusion of efficient and effective use of all available resources holds particular promise for developing critical thinking skills, problem solving skills, communication skills, creativity, immediate sharing of knowledge and strengthening total learning. These skills provide for empowerment of all learners, thus forming the impetus for building communities of "lifelong learners."

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
Baich, Kathy	Principal	Implementation and monitoring of School Improvement Plan
Mendoza, Adrianne	Assistant Principal	Implementation and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan
Gomez, Nikki	Assistant Principal	Implementation and monitoring of school improvement plan
Robinson, Angella	Dean	Implementation and monitoring of School Improvement Plan
Siders, Chantel	Instructional Coach	Support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan through Instructional Coaching (K-5 Literacy)
Taylor, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan through Instructional Coaching (K-5 Mathematics)
Donayre, Mandi	Instructional Coach	Support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan through Instructional Coaching (K-2 Instruction)
Mickens, Aisha	Other	Supports MTSS processes, Attendance initiatives, resiliency of all students.
Whitman, Alexandra	Other	Support the needs of all students especially those students with disabilities..

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.

School Advisory Council supports the development of, approval of, and implementation of the School Improvement Plan at St. Lucie Elementary. The cadre of individuals involved in SAC include members of the community, parent/guardians of students, and faculty/staff from St. Lucie Elementary. The SIP is presented to all stakeholders at our initial SAC meeting in August with documented approval of plans for improvement. Throughout the school year (monthly), the SIP plans for improvement and student data is shared with all stakeholders.

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

School Improvement Goals and Strategies are reviewed for effective implementation at instructional leadership team meetings, administrative leadership meetings, and at monthly School Advisory Council meetings with a distinct focus on students meeting and exceeding the state's academic standards with a focus on students with the greatest achievement gaps. As needed the Instructional Leadership Team at St. Lucie Elementary will revise and edit plans for improvement as needed and discussed during meetings and as data is gathered from all Progress Monitoring (PM1, PM2, PM3) and through instructional walkthroughs.

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	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	13	53	59	46	41	39	0	0	0	251
One or more suspensions	0	6	7	12	10	6	0	0	0	41
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	29	13	36	1	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	0	27	21	39	1	2	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	51	67	14	63	39	0	0	0	234
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	63	34	55	60	37	0	0	0	249
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	31	50	45	49	32	0	0	0	212

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	71	76	66	71	48	0	0	0	334

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	7	2	1	0	0	0	13
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	59	43	62	50	39	55	0	0	0	308
One or more suspensions	2	6	12	8	21	35	0	0	0	84
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	52	77	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	53	45	85	0	0	0	183
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	6	11	34	58	87	0	0	0	196

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	12	1	0	0	0	0	13
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	59	43	62	50	39	55	0	0	0	308
One or more suspensions	2	6	12	8	21	35	0	0	0	84
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	52	77	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	53	45	85	0	0	0	183
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	6	11	34	58	87	0	0	0	196

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	12	1	0	0	0	0	13
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*	23	44	53	23	46	56	24		
ELA Learning Gains				40			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			52		
Math Achievement*	32	52	59	27	43	50	25		
Math Learning Gains				48			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			31		
Science Achievement*	21	49	54	23	50	59	23		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	36	58	59	47			48		

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	130
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	302
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	2	2
ELL	31	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	24	Yes	2	1
HSP	28	Yes	1	1
MUL	23	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	2	
FRL	25	Yes	2	1

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	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	41			

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	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	29	Yes	1	1
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	23			32			21					36
SWD	11			16			19				5	33
ELL	24			49			21				5	36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			28			21				5	33
HSP	28			45			15				5	36
MUL	15			31							2	
PAC												
WHT	42			33							2	
FRL	23			32			20				5	34

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	23	40	37	27	48	57	23					47
SWD	11	23	30	9	38	44	14					37
ELL	23	37		31	44		17					47
AMI												
ASN												

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	21	39	36	21	46	58	21					50
HSP	29	44		41	52		31					46
MUL	25			55								
PAC												
WHT	27	30		31								
FRL	23	42	38	26	49	58	25					45

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	24	40	52	25	23	31	23					48
SWD	18	15	25	21	13	18	23					26
ELL	28	61		33	27		25					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	35	46	22	26	35	18					48
HSP	32	50		35	16		23					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40			27								
FRL	22	38	53	26	22	32	22					49

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	27%	46%	-19%	54%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	27%	52%	-25%	58%	-31%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	14%	42%	-28%	50%	-36%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	21%	52%	-31%	59%	-38%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	56%	-11%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	48%	-15%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	18%	47%	-29%	51%	-33%

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 22-23 F.A.S.T. data component which yielded the lowest performance was in the area of Reading; particularly in grade 3. In 22-23 students in grade 3 yield the lowest percentage of overall reading proficiency growth from 6% proficient to 17% proficient. 4th grade students in 22-23 demonstrated proficiency growth from 7% proficient during PM1 to 29% proficient in PM3 and 5th grade demonstrated proficiency growth from 14% to 27% proficient during PM3. Review of I-Ready Reading Fall Diagnostic Assessment yielded that 33% of students in grade 3 were performing two or more grade levels below the 3rd grade level and demonstrated deficits in the areas of phonological awareness and phonics. Additional contributing factors associated with last year's low performance included teacher understanding and implementation of benchmark/standards (new); new assessment platform (F.A.S.T.), and teacher overall proficiency.

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

The 22-23 F.A.S.T. data component which yielded the greatest decline from the previous year's scores performance was in the area of Reading; particularly in grade 3. In 22-23 students in grade 3 yield the lowest percentage of overall reading proficiency growth from 6% proficient to 17% proficient. 4th grade students in 22-23 demonstrated proficiency growth from 7% proficient during PM1 to 29% proficient in PM3 and 5th grade demonstrated proficiency growth from 14% to 27% proficient during PM3. Review of I-Ready Reading Fall Diagnostic Assessment yielded that 33% of students in grade 3 were performing

two or more grade levels below the 3rd grade level and demonstrated deficits in the areas of phonological awareness and phonics. Additional contributing factors associated with last year's low performance included teacher understanding and implementation of benchmark/standards (new); new assessment platform (F.A.S.T.), and teacher overall 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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science - grade 5 proficiency. The state overall average for grade 5 proficiency (level 3 or higher) for the 22-23 school year was 51% and the overall average for St. Lucie Elementary was 22%. A difference of 29%. The contributing factors associated with last year's performance gap in science include teacher understanding of the standards, teachers new to the content, and incoming reading proficiency of students.

Additional reading proficiency on the F.A.S.T. assessment had a large gap when compared to the state average. Overall, the state average was 50% and St. Lucie Elementary yield 23% of the students were proficient on the the F.A.S.T. assessment. A difference of 27%. The contributing factors associated with last year's performance gap in reading included teacher understanding and implementation of benchmark/standards (new); new assessment platform (F.A.S.T.), and teacher overall proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in the area of Mathematics. Students in grade 3 yielded mathematics proficiency of 3% in PM1 and mathematics proficiency of 26% in PM3 an overall increase of 23%. Students in grade 4 yielded mathematics proficiency of 5% in PM1 and mathematics proficiency of 47% in PM3 an overall increase of 42%. Students in grade 5 yielded mathematics proficiency of 7% in PM1 and mathematics proficiency of 33% in PM3 an overall increase of 26%. The new actions taken 3-5 mathematics included the implementation of a Math MTSS instructional block where students practiced fluency activities, a restructuring of the mathematics instructional block to ensure transitions to small group instruction, math intervention support by two full time math interventionists and 2 - part-time math interventionists.

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

Area of Concern 1: Student Attendance/Absences
Area of Concern 2: Number of Level 1 Students Reading/Mathematics

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

1. Proficiency and Learning Gains Across Reading and Mathematics
2. Proficiency in Science
3. Understanding and Implementation of Benchmarks/Standards-Based Instruction
4. Engage students in benchmarks/standards-based practice activities that help students develop automaticity of skills, strategies, and processes.
5. Engage students with opportunities to actively engage with the critical content associated with the benchmarks/standards.

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.

The 22-23 F.A.S.T. data component which yielded the lowest performance was in the area of Reading; particularly in grade 3. In 22-23 students in grade 3 yield the lowest percentage of overall reading proficiency growth from 6% proficient to 17% proficient. 4th grade students in 22-23 demonstrated proficiency growth from 7% proficient during PM1 to 29% proficient in PM3 and 5th grade demonstrated proficiency growth from 14% to 27% proficient during PM3. Review of I-Ready Reading Fall Diagnostic Assessment yielded that 33% of students in grade 3 were performing two or more grade levels below the 3rd grade level and demonstrated deficits in the areas of phonological awareness and phonics. Subgroup focuses will include students with disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL)

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

2023-24 school wide ELA/Reading targets are a minimum of 41% of students in grades
3-5 on PM3 of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Test will score in the
proficient range. ELA/Reading targets for learning gains are a minimum of 65% and ELA/Reading learning gains for students in the bottom quartile are a minimum of 65%.

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

Administrators, instructional coaches, district personnel, and CLP turnaround lead teachers will facilitate and support Collaborative Learning and Planning meetings (CLPs); provide professional learning opportunities for teachers; and review summative and formative data on an on-going basis. Instructional Coaches and District Instructional Partners will provide opportunities to support building the capacity of teacher quality through instructional coaching and modeling. Additional staff (reading interventionists, resource teachers, teacher's aides) will provide additional support for students through remedial and accelerated activities aligned the ELA B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Baich (kathyann.panusbaich@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.)

1. Benchmark based core Tier 1 opportunities for all students aligned to the ELA
B.E.S.T. benchmarks.
2. Professional development opportunities with a focus on the implementation and
monitoring of Tier 1 instructional practices; student engagement strategies; data focused
instruction and feedback; and professional learning opportunities aligned to the
B.E.S.T. benchmarks.
3. Ongoing development, implementation and review of formative and summative
assessments (teacher-created and district-adopted).
4. Research-based literacy routines and instructional best practices.
5. Utilize school, classroom and individual data trends to provide actionable feedback
that results in changes to instructional practice and student outcomes.
6. CLP protocols and Classroom Walkthroughs that ensure the monitoring of
instructional practices from planning to instruction in the classroom.
7. School-wide evidenced based Phonics intervention (Reading Horizons) implemented in grades K-5 to

address student deficiencies in the area of decoding.
8. Level Literacy Intervention (research-based) utilized during the MTSS reading block to support Tier 2 students' deficiencies in the areas of vocabulary and comprehension for identified students.
9. Tier 3 instructional support provided by Reading Certified - Reading Interventionists

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

1. Students should be afforded the opportunity to have access to grade level appropriate
Tier1 instruction and when necessary students should be given the opportunity to
participate in remediation (Tier2) or accelerated activities to maximize their learning
experience. https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/
https://www.ncld.org/reports-studies/promising-practices-to-accelerate-learning-for?students-with-
disabilities-during-covid-19-and-beyond/part-1-research-based?approaches-to-accelerate-learning/
2. Research supports that student achievement and growth can be attributed to teacher
capacity. By providing teachers with professional learning opportunities of value -
student achievement will increase.
https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/
Effective_Teacher_Professional_Development_BRIEF.pdf
3. The continuous improvement model supports the Plan-Do-Study-Act - 4 step problem
solving model as a protocol for monitoring student learning by continuously evaluating
both formative and summative assessments teachers can make just in time decisions
about teaching and learning. https://www.nctm.org/Research-and-Advocacy/research?brief-and-clips/
Benefits-of-Formative-Assessment/
4. Clear structural outcomes for CLPs and transference to instruction in the classroom
will positively impact student learning in the classroom https://research.com/education/
teacher-collaboration-guide

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Establish clear expectations and protocols for CLP practices and afford teachers the opportunity to collaboratively plan after school (UNISIG funding for teacher compensation).
2. Ensure a transference of content from CLPs to the classroom.
3. Monitor benchmark-based instruction and tasks with fidelity (design and implementation).
4. Utilize available data sources (district, school, classroom, and individual) and data trends to provide actionable feedback that results in changes to instructional practices (for teachers) and student academic outcomes in the classroom.
5. Continuous professional learning opportunities aligned to the ELA B.E.S.T. benchmarks.
6. Ensure that teachers support through planning and classroom instruction activities that engage students in developing automaticity while practicing skills, strategies, and processes.
7. Additional teacher position to grade 3 to support reading instruction and decrease class size (UNISIG)
8. Additional reading interventionist to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading instruction for students with reading deficiencies.

Person Responsible: Kathy Baich (kathyann.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org)

By When: On-Going Throughout the School Year.

#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.

In an effort to increase Mathematics proficiency and student achievement of learning gains - mathematics is an additional area of focus for St. Lucie Elementary. Students in grade 3 yielded mathematics proficiency of 3% in PM1 and mathematics proficiency of 26% in PM3 an overall increase of 23%. Students in grade 4 yielded mathematics proficiency of 5% in PM1 and mathematics proficiency of 47% in PM3 an overall increase of 42%. Students in grade 5 yielded mathematics proficiency of 7% in PM1 and mathematics proficiency of 33% in PM3 an overall increase of 26%. Students with disabilities and English Language Learners will be specific subgroups address within this area of focus.

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

2023-24 school wide Mathematics targeted percentages are a minimum of 41% of students in grades 3-5 on PM3 of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Test will score in the proficient range. 65% of all students in grades 4 and 5 and retained students in grade 3 will achieve learning gains in the area of mathematics and at least 65% of all students in grades 4 and 5 and retained students in grade 3 - 5 will achieve bottom quartile learning gains.

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

Administrators, instructional coaches, district personnel, and CLP turnaround lead teachers will facilitate and support Collaborative Learning and Planning meetings (CLPs); provide professional learning opportunities for teachers; and review summative and formative data on an on-going basis. Instructional Coaches and District Instructional Partners will provide opportunities to support building the capacity of teacher quality through instructional coaching and modeling. Additional staff (interventionists, resource teachers, teacher's aides) will provide additional support for students through both remedial and accelerated activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adrianne Mendoza (adrianne.mendoza@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.)

1. Benchmark based core and supplemental curriculum (remediation/acceleration) opportunities for all students through SAVVAS materials and supplemental programs such as i-Ready (research-based intervention).
2. Professional development opportunities with a focus on the implementation and monitoring of Tier 1 instructional practices (new Mathematics Curriculum Savvas); student engagement strategies (Kagan); supplemental curriculum (i-Ready); data focused instruction and feedback; and the implementation of the new B.E.S.T. benchmarks.
3. Ongoing development, implementation and review of formative and summative assessments (teacher-created and district-adopted).
4. Research-based routines and instructional best practices (5-E model) supported by the Mathematics B.E.S.T. benchmarks.
5. Utilize school, classroom and individual data trends to provide actionable feedback that results in changes to instructional practice and student outcomes.

6. CLP protocols and Classroom Walkthroughs that ensure the monitoring of instructional practices from planning to instruction in the classroom that align to the Mathematics B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

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

1. Students should be afforded the opportunity to have access to grade level appropriate Tier1 instruction and when necessary students should be given the opportunity to participate in remediation (Tier2) or accelerated activities to maximize their learning experience. https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/
https://www.ncld.org/reports-studies/promising-practices-to-accelerate-learning-for?students-with-disabilities-during-covid-19-and-beyond/part-1-research-based-approaches?to-accelerate-learning/
2. Research supports that student achievement and growth can be attributed to teacher capacity. By providing teachers with professional learning opportunities of value - student achievement will increase.
https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/
Effective_Teacher_Professional_Development_BRIEF.pdf
3. The continuous improvement model supports the Plan-Do-Study-Act - 4 step problem solving model as a protocol for monitoring student learning by continuously evaluating both formative and summative assessments teachers can make just in time decisions about teaching and learning. https://www.nctm.org/Research-and-Advocacy/research?brief-and-clips/
Benefits-of-Formative-Assessment/
4. Clear structural outcomes for CLPs and transference to instruction in the classroom will positively impact student learning in the classroom https://research.com/education/
teacher-collaboration-guide

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Establish clear expectations and protocols for CLP practices and afford teachers the opportunity to collaboratively plan after school (UNISIG funding for teacher compensation).
2. Ensure a transference of content from CLPs to the classroom.
3. Monitor benchmark-based instruction and tasks with fidelity (design and implementation).
4. Utilize available data sources (district, school, classroom, and individual) and data trends to provide actionable feedback that results in changes to instructional practices (for teachers) and student academic outcomes in the classroom.
5. Provide additional supports to teachers with the implementation and facilitation of a newly adopted Mathematics Curriculum SAVVAS, Math Supplemental Curriculum and Mathematics B.E.S.T. benchmarks
6. Secure additional mathematics interventionists to support math instruction (UNISIG)

Person Responsible: Adrianne Mendoza (adrianne.mendoza@stlucieschools.org)

By When: On-Going Throughout the School Year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science - grade 5 proficiency. The state overall average for grade 5 proficiency (level 3 or higher) for the 22-23 school year was 51% and the overall average for St. Lucie Elementary was 22%. A difference of 29%.

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

2022-23 school wide Science targeted percentages are a minimum of 41% for students taking the grade 5 NGSSS Science Assessment.

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

Administrators, instructional coaches, district personnel, and CLP turnaround lead teachers will facilitate and support Collaborative Learning and Planning meetings (CLPs); provide professional learning opportunities for teachers; and review summative and formative data on an on-going basis. Instructional Coaches and District Instructional Partners will provide opportunities to support building the capacity of teacher quality through instructional coaching and modeling.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

1. Benchmark based core, supplemental curriculum (J&J Boot Camp) and hands?on labs will be implemented with fidelity; PENDA Science - online support program.
2. Professional development opportunities with a focus on the implementation and monitoring of Science instructional practices; student engagement strategies (Kagan); supplemental curriculum (J&J Boot Camp); data focused instruction and feedback.
3. Ongoing development, implementation and review of formative and summative assessments (teacher-created and district-adopted).
4. Research-based instructional best practices will be implemented with fidelity.
5. Utilize school, classroom and individual data trends to provide actionable feedback that results in changes to instructional practice and student outcomes.
6. CLP protocols and Classroom Walkthroughs that ensure the monitoring of instructional practices from planning to instruction in the classroom

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

1. Students should be afforded the opportunity to have access to grade level appropriate Tier1 instruction and when necessary students should be given the opportunity to participate in remediation (Tier2) or accelerated activities to maximize their learning experience. https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/
https://www.ncld.org/reports-studies/promising-practices-to-accelerate-learning-for?students-with-disabilities-during-covid-19-and-beyond/part-1-research-based?approaches-to-accelerate-learning/
2. Research supports that student achievement and growth can be attributed to

teacher capacity. By providing teachers with professional learning opportunities of value - student achievement will increase.
https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Effective_Teacher_Professional_Development_BRIEF.pdf
3. The continuous improvement model supports the Plan-Do-Study-Act - 4 step problem solving model as a protocol for monitoring student learning by continuously evaluating both formative and summative assessments teachers can make just in time decisions about teaching and learning. https://www.nctm.org/Research-and-Advocacy/research-brief-and-clips/Benefits-of-Formative?Assessment/
4. Clear structural outcomes for CLPs and transference to instruction in the classroom will positively impact student learning in the classroom.
https://research.com/education/teacher-collaboration-guide

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Establish clear expectations and protocols for CLP practices.
2. Ensure a transference of content from CLPs to the classroom.
3. Monitor standards-based instruction and tasks with fidelity (design and implementation).
4. Utilize available data sources (district, school, classroom, and individual) and data trends to provide actionable feedback that results in changes to instructional practices (for teachers) and student academic outcomes in the classroom.
5. Engage Science teachers in additional professional learning and support opportunities with School Renewal and District Support.

Person Responsible: Angella Robinson (angella.robinson@stlucieschools.org)

By When: On Going Throughout the School Year

#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.

Through the analysis of student survey data (Panorama) and teacher climate survey data; as well as student discipline, attendance, and early warning system indicators it is evident that each of these indicators yield an area of concern which has impacted student achievement and teacher efficacy about student learning.

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

If we implement a single school culture, teacher efficacy will increase, students' perceptions of safety and a sense of belonging will increase. As measured by a 25% decrease in ODRs/BIRs, increase attendance among students with attendance below 90%, and increase in the Panorama survey data.

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

1. St. Lucie Elementary will implement updated Single School Culture (SSC) protocols for school-wide expectations; all staff and students will receive training on the established expectations; re-trainings and refreshers will be provided throughout the school year.
2. An I-Succeed Committee will be established to monitor student early warning systems data, SSC expectations, and Early Warning Systems Data for students - this committee will meet monthly to review school wide data and develop action plans when necessary.
3. To address EWS - specifically attendance of students with 10% or higher absences - the attendance committee comprised of school administration, school counselors, social worker, truancy advocate, data specialist - meet bi-weekly to review student attendance, plan for attendance strategies to meet the needs of students exhibiting EWS around attendance.
4. Instructional time devoted to the development of Life Skills for students will be scheduled daily and walkthroughs conducted to monitor the fidelity of implementation. Guidance will meet regularly with administration to provide updates of student progress.
5. Life Skills groups will be implemented and supported by the Guidance team to meet the needs of students who exhibit multiple Early Warning indicators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@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.)

1. St. Lucie Elementary will implement updated Single School Culture (SSC) protocols for school-wide expectations.
2. An I-Succeed Committee will be established to monitor student early warning systems data, SSC expectations, and Early Warning Systems Data for students.
3. Instructional time devoted to the development of Life Skills for students will be scheduled daily in K-5 classrooms.
4. Life Skills groups will be implemented and supported by the Guidance team to meet the needs of students who exhibit multiple Early Warning indicators.
5. Professional development on strategies to engage students will be afforded to teachers.

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

In an effort to establish a positive learning environment at school and development a positive home-school connection with students and their families, the need to provide positive culture and life skills in the learning environment is necessary. Many of the students at St. Lucie Elementary exhibit critical needs in the areas of positive culture and life skills as exhibited by behavior and attendance data. With the successful implementation of school wide positive culture and life skills strategies, a decrease in discipline data and absenteeism will result in changes in school culture and student academic achievement. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/positive-culture-in-urban-schools.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Implement and monitor with fidelity agreed upon school-wide Single School Culture expectations and develop scripts for
implementation throughout the school year. (adopted by all staff).
2. Adopt AVID curriculum to foster a school-wide college and career atmosphere (UNISIG funds); establish AVID Site Team comprised of teachers, administrators, school counselors to ensure the fidelity of implementation of AVID.
3. Schedule time during the school day for students to engage in positive culture and life skills classes with their teachers (Resiliency Circles)
4. I-Succeed, PBIS, Attendance Committees meet regularly to review Early Warning Systems Data and develop action plans as necessary.
5. Create system for PBIS token economy and the recognition of positive behavioral attributes.
6. Establish Attendance Action Team to monitor attendance trends bi-monthly as well as create and implement attendance initiatives and programs to support students attending school (involving school-based staff, District staff, and community partnerships)
7. Attend ASCD Leadership Summit Conference (Title I) to discover ways to navigate rapid change, adapt to shifting social dynamics and integrate educational technology to help students and educators succeed.
8. Leadership Team to attend National ASCD Conference (ASCD) in an effort to ensure equity and belonging and give every student access to the educational resources and quality teaching they need to thrive in changing learning landscapes.
9. Utilize various forms of communication tools to engage parents in student learning (i.e. school messenger; social media, school email, Class Dojo).

Person Responsible: Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)

By When: On-Going Throughout the Year

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).

School budgets as they relate to additional school improvement funding will be reviewed monthly during SAC meetings by the school administrators and SAC chairperson; monthly meetings with SLPS District grants supervisor will meet with St. Lucie Elementary administrative team to review initiatives and funding as it relates to Title I and UNISIG.

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

During the 2022-23 school year, 47% of students in grade K-2 score two or more grade levels below on the STAR Reading/Early Literacy Assessment, 18% score one grade level below and 34% of students in grades K-2 scored at or above grade level on the STAR Reading/Early Literacy Assessment. 65% percent of students at St. Lucie Elementary are identified as working one or more grade levels below their assigned grade level and the identified deficit for these students lies within the area of decoding including both phonemic awareness and phonics skill deficits. The instructional practice focus for students in grade K-2 is phonics.

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

During the 2022-23 school year, 75%+ of students in grades 3-5 score one or more grade levels. The instructional practice specifically related to reading for students in grades 3-5 is Vocabulary acquisition strategies and comprehension strategies.

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

65% of K-2 students will demonstrate a grade level increase of at least 20 percentage points from 2022-23 to
2023-24 on the STAR Early Literacy/Reading Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

65% of Students in grades 4 and 5 will demonstrate a grade level learning gain in Reading/ELA and/or maintain proficiency as evidenced by the F.A.S.T. Reading Test (PM3 2022-23 to PM3 2023-24).

41% of students in grades 3 will score a Level 3 or higher as demonstrated on the F.A.S.T. Reading Test (PM3 2023-24).

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.

-Designated time for Collaborative Learning and Planning are scheduled for each grade level.
-Collaborative Learning and Planning sessions are attended by at least one member of the administrative
team, instructional coach, and CLP trained team lead.
-On-going classroom walkthroughs with data collection protocols for both qualitative and quantitative data
collection with a focus on CLP transference; Benchmark-driven lessons implemented and monitored
-On-going data collection: STAR Assessments and F.A.S.T. Reading (PM1, PM2, & PM3); i-Ready Fall and
Spring Diagnostic Assessments; SLPS Unit Assessments (Grades 2-5); BAS Assessments (Reading Running Records); K-2 Progress Monitoring Tools (on-going)

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

Baich, Kathy, kathyann.panusbaich@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?

Benchmark Advance - Core Tier 1 Reading Program (with built-in intervention supports)
i-Reading Adaptive Reading Computer-Based Supplemental Curriculum
Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) - Tier II Curriculum Support for MTSS Instructional Block
Tier III Intervention Supports - Fundations; Reading Horizons; Benchmark Advanced Intervention Material

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?

Benchmark Advance - Core Tier 1 Reading Program (with built-in intervention supports)
Identified Need K-2: Phonics: YES
Identified Need 3-5 Vocabulary & Reading Comprehension: YES

i-Reading Adaptive Reading Computer-Based Supplemental Curriculum
Identified Need K-2: Phonics: YES
Identified Need 3-5 Vocabulary & Reading Comprehension: YES

Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) - Tier II Curriculum Support for MTSS Instructional Block
Identified Need 3-5 Vocabulary & Reading Comprehension: YES

Tier III Intervention Supports - Fundations; Reading Horizons; Benchmark Advanced Intervention Materials
for Vocabulary, Fluency, and Reading Comprehension
Identified Need K-2: Phonics: YES
Identified Need 3-5 Vocabulary & Reading Comprehension: YES

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
Literacy Leadership: -Monthly Meetings with a cadre of Reading Leaders within the School -Weekly walkthrough data collected on the focus areas of literacy -Instructional Leadership (Reading Certified/Endorsed Instructional Coaches and Administrators) -On-Going Literacy Trainings and Professional Development by Literacy Leadership Team and Experts in the Field of Literacy	Baich, Kathy, kathyann.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org
Literacy Coaching -Literacy Coaches highly qualified (Certified and/or Endorsed in the Area of Reading -Monthly Literacy Coach trainings (District/State) -RAISE Literacy Symposium Trainings (attended by Coaches) -Coaching Support by Just Read Florida Literacy Specialist - Mandi Rowland	Baich, Kathy, kathyann.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org
Assessments Assessments are planned and administered throughout the school year. -STAR and F.A.S.T. Assessments will be administered 3 times per year (PM1/PM2/PM3) -I-Ready Fall and Spring Diagnostic Assessments -St. Lucie Public Schools - Unit Assessments (Math/Science/Reading) -School created - Monthly Writing Prompts with Calibrated Collaborative Scoring -BAS assessments (Reading Running Records) administered quarterly for progress monitoring of Tier II intervention block utilizing Leveled Literacy Intervention Materials	Baich, Kathy, kathyann.panusbaich@stlucieschools.org
Professional Learning: -On-going weekly professional development opportunities during Collaborative Learning and Planning -Quarterly professional development opportunities from Benchmark Advance - Tier I from publisher -Monthly literacy professional development provided by literacy coaches, literacy interventionists, and administrators. -Reading Endorsement Coursework provided by District Teaching & Learning Department -RAISE Symposium Trainings & Support from Just Read Florida Office - Mandi Rowland	Baich, Kathy, kathyann.panusbaich@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.

During monthly School Advisory Council meetings, the School Improvement Plan will be discussed and reviewed with stakeholders (including community members, parents, and faculty/staff). The School Improvement Plan will be shared on the school webpage and a copy of the School Improvement Plan will be housed in the front office and upon request can be given to families, community members or staff members for review.

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))

Monthly parental communication workshops about curriculum, assessment, and student well-being supported by our school counselors and academic leadership team.
Quarterly parent engagement workshops held in the evening (Curriculum Night, Literacy Night, Mathematics Night; Data/Assessment Night).

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)

-Before, During, and After School Supports for both enrichment and acceleration will be offered to all students.
-Summer STEM Camp offered to students in the intermediate grades for students demonstrating proficiency in ELA/Mathematics.

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))

St. Lucie Elementary School ensures counseling in a multitude of ways. The counselors on campus implement school-based mental health services by providing individual and group counseling to students in need as a Tier 2 intervention. We have a district based mental health counselor on campus once a week as a Tier 3 intervention for students who need the services. School counselors provide classroom guidance through district curriculum of Safer, Smarter Kids as well. We communicate daily with parents, teachers, and all stakeholders involved in the students' academic and behavioral success, also providing community resources to families as necessary. Outside the academic subject areas, we support behavioral interventions and monitor students' progress through Tier 2 and 3 behavioral interventions, counseling services as mentioned above, and ongoing communication. Each classroom is provided with a Break Bin including tools and items for students to take a break and utilize coping skills taught to them. School counselors schedule, hold, and attend meetings for students of behavioral and academic concerns, MTSS processes, and ESOL students. In supporting the ESOL program, counselors screen, test, conduct continuations, hold re-evaluation meetings, conduct ACCESS Testing, communicate with parents about Imagine Learning program and student scores, monitor progress, and provide data through pulling reports in Skyward, ELLevation, DRC and PEER platforms.

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).

At St. Lucie Elementary all teachers and staff have adopted a Single School Culture embedded with high expectations for all students. Our Single School Culture highlights teacher expectations, students' expectations, supports and consequences. These expectations are normed and modeled as required to ensure that students understand. These expectations are communicated with parents so that they can support their children towards success.

Additionally, St. Lucie Elementary has implemented a PBIS model to complement our Single School Culture. Teachers provide positive rewards when a student's behavior meets the expectations which are explicit and simple. Students are rewarded with our school token economy which they can use to purchase products from the PBIS school store and participate in other monthly PBIS events across our campus. Teachers are encouraged to maintain open and regular communication lines with parents for all things related to the education of their child, negative or positive. One especially successful piece of this are positive referrals, where a teacher or staff can recognize a student for outstanding behavior. The student's parent receives a call celebrating the student from an administrator and the student also receives a tangible reward.

Through a needs analysis staff identify areas of need and tier students supports. At the tier 2 level, sometimes students need a little support. For those students there are systems in place adapted to the individual needs of the student. Some students have a campus mentor, an individual they can connect with when they need to reset. Others require a daily check in/check out person, who sees them at the beginning of the day to get them off to the right start and checks them out at the end of the day. Other students have several check-ins during the day. We create behavior contracts, Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), structured breaks, teach social and behavioral skills, have daily behavior form (point sheet) and refer students to our school counselors when needed. At tier 3 students may be receiving several different supports including possible outside agency support.

All student discipline is closely monitored to determine if a student needs tier 2 or tier 3 interventions. At tier 2 and 3 there is constant communication between home and school, regular conferences to discuss and update on collected data. Behavioral and academic data informs the area of focus as we identify

and determine intervention based on identified early warning signs.

During instruction, teachers use the CHAMPs classroom management model to norm their expectations as they move students towards proficiency. Students recognize what their actions should be as they move through the different pieces of the instructional model. Teachers incorporate ESE and ESOL differentiation strategies and address 504 accommodations to ensure that all students have access and the support needed to be successful both academically and behaviorally every day.

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))

The examples of types of continuing growth at St. Lucie Elementary include team building, out of state conferences, in state conferences, courses offered through the district, classroom walkthroughs made within the various grade levels, collaborating with teachers outside of the school, collaborating with district leadership about academics (instructional partners and the curriculum department), subject area coaches providing activities and professional development, leadership development, engaging educators in ongoing self-reflection, peer support through the NEST program, engagement strategies and modification of instruction (through CLPs) and management practices based on student performance data, student work, and both learning and social behaviors. Through an intensive process of collaborative and job-embedded learning, teachers gain content knowledge and technical strategies where they can gain an improved understanding of their own teaching and learning and of the various ways by which students learn.

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))

Each year St. Lucie Elementary hosts a kindergarten round up to support students transition from preschool to elementary school. Students and parents are invited to come in and participate in several activities. Students are oriented into a day of "life" in kindergarten, including breakfast or lunch in the cafeteria. Teachers work with students through hands-on centers while others are screened to ensure the best placement is made prior to school beginning. Parents take part in a parent session learning of the ways to support their students throughout the transition as well as "school know how". Finally, parents are provided with a pre-K transition kit complete with workbook pages and manipulatives. Parents are shown how to use the manipulatives and how to engage their child in quick learning centers to build a foundation for kindergarten on day one.

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				$205,993.15
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$50,921.62
			Notes: Certified teacher- Supplemental 3rd grade teacher to reduce class sizes providing more individual attention to student needs.			
	5100	210	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,910.06

			Notes: Retirement - calculated at 13.57% for certified teacher.			
	5100	220	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,895.00
			Notes: FICA - calculated at 7.65% for certified teacher			
	5100	231	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,800.00
			Notes: Group insurance - benefit calculated to $7800 per FTE.			
	5100	240	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,200.00
			Notes: Workers' Comp - benefit calculated at $1200 per FTE			
	5100	120	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$53,340.11
			Notes: Certified teacher with reading endorsement/certification as a reading interventionist to provide tier 2 and tier 3 reading interventions to identified students.			
	5100	210	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,238.25
			Notes: Retirement - calculated at 13.57% for certified teacher.			
	5100	220	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,080.52
			Notes: FICA - calculated at 7.65% for certified teacher			
	5100	231	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,800.00
			Notes: Group insurance - benefit calculated to $7800 per FTE.			
	5100	240	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,200.00
			Notes: Workers' Comp - benefit calculated at $1200 per FTE per.			
	6400	120	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$19,680.00
			Notes: Supplemental collaborative planning for K-5 ELA teacher for standards-based instruction for a total of 656 hours at $30 per hour.			
	5100	510	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$8,010.49
			Notes: Supplies- data folders for tracking student progress; supplies for modeling standards based instruction and for student engagement in learning.			
	5100	510	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,976.00
			Notes: Supplemental writing curriculum for 2nd and 3rd grade - Top Score Teacher Edition Print Curriculum Set			
	5100	510	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,640.00
			Notes: Supplemental grammar and phonics curriculum for grades K-2 - Benchmark Education consumable classroom sets			
	6400	210	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,670.58
			Notes: Retirement - calculated at 13.57% for supplemental collaboration planning for a total of 656 hours at $30 per hour			

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	220	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,505.52
			Notes: FICA - calculated at 7.65% for supplemental collaboration planning for a total of 656 hours at $30 per hour			
	5100	330	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$19,125.00
			Notes: Field Trips for students in grades K-5: K, 1, 2 - Brevard Zoo - 300 students x $16.95 = $5085 3 - Sea World - 100 students x $34 = $3400 4 - St. Augustine - 80 students x $75 = $6000 Total = $19,125 5 - Kennedy Space Center - 80 students X $58 = $4640			
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$94,154.65**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG	0.5	$25,000.00
			Notes: Certified teacher - part time math interventionist to support tier 2 and 3 interventions for students identified as below grade level			
	5100	210	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,392.50
			Notes: Retirement - calculated at 13.57% for part time math interventionist.			
	5100	220	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,912.50
			Notes: FICA - calculated at 7.65% for part time math interventionist			
	5100	240	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$600.00
			Notes: Workers' Comp - Benefit calculated at $1200 per FTE, part time math interventionist .5 FTE = $600.			
	5100	120	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG	0.5	$25,000.00
			Notes: Certified teacher - part time math interventionist to support tier 2 and 3 interventions for students identified as below grade level			
	5100	210	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,392.50
			Notes: Retirement - calculated at 13.57% for part time math interventionist.			
	5100	220	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,912.50
			Notes: FICA - calculated at 7.65% for part time math interventionist			
	5100	240	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$600.00
			Notes: Workers' Comp - Benefit calculated at $1200 per FTE, part time math interventionist .5 FTE = $600.			
	6400	120	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$19,740.00
			Notes: Supplemental collaborative planning for K-5 math teachers for standards-based instruction for a total of 658 hours at $30 per hour.			
	5100	510	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$8,415.82

			Notes: Supplies- data folders for tracking student progress; supplies for modeling standards-based instruction and for student engagement in learning.			
	6400	210	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,678.72
			Notes: Retirement - calculated at 13.57% for supplemental collaboration planning for a total of 658 hours at $30 per hour			
	6400	220	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,510.11
			Notes: FICA - calculated at 7.65% for supplemental collaboration planning for a total of 658 hours at $30 per hour			
3	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$6,182.22**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	120	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,100.00
			Notes: Supplemental collaborative planning for 3-5 science teachers for standards-based instruction for a total of 170 hours at $30 per hour.			
	6400	210	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$692.07
			Notes: Retirement - calculated at 13.57% for supplemental collaboration planning for a total of 170 hours at $30 per hour			
	6400	220	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$390.15
			Notes: FICA - calculated at 7.65% for supplemental collaboration planning for a total of 170 hours at $30 per hour			
4	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other**				**$18,655.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	330	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,126.00
			Notes: ASCD Conference - Washington, DC; March 22-25, 2024: Principal, Assistant Principal, Assistant Principal, Teacher on Special Assignment Registration - $750 x 4 = $3000 Flights - $350 x 4 = $1400 Hotel - $250 x 4 = $4,000 Food - $36 x 4 x 4= $576 Airport transfers and parking - $150 Total - $9,126.00			
	6400	330	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,794.00
			Notes: AVID Conference - Orlando; June 26-28, 2024; 3 teachers Conference Registration - $1000 x 3 = $3000 Hotel - $250 x 3 teachers x 3 nights = $2250 Meals - $36 x 3 x 3 = $324 Transportation - $55 a day x 4 = 220			
	5100	730	0071 - St. Lucie Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,735.00
			Notes: AVID - 1 year membership for school-wide implementation			
					Total:	**$324,985.02**

Budget Approval

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

No