

St. Lucie Public Schools

Lakewood Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
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	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Lakewood Park Elementary School

7800 INDRIIO RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34951

<http://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/lwp/>

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Lakewood Park Elementary is to provide all students a safe and positive learning environment, focused on rigorous academic curriculum, and continuous student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lakewood Park, in partnership with families and the community, will strive to be a premiere learning center of academic excellence. Each student will be afforded the opportunity to reach his or her maximum potential to be a successful citizen in the global society.

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
Melrose, Kathleen	Principal	Monitor school improvement goals and coordinate collaboration amongst the leadership team.
Carter, Charlene	Reading Coach	To collaborate with leadership team and teachers to implement strategies to improve ELA achievement.
Steward, Ashley	Math Coach	To collaborate with leadership team and teachers to implement strategies to improve Math Achievement.
Monroe, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Monitor school improvement goals and coordinate collaboration amongst the leadership team.
Deubel, Mattie	Reading Coach	To collaborate with leadership team and teachers to implement strategies to improve ELA achievement.
Forsyth, Mary	Other	Collaborate with leadership team and ESE teachers and monitor all ESE student achievement and growth.
Burke, Natalee	School Counselor	Collaborate with the leadership team and monitor ELL student Achievement and Growth.
Williams, Dara	School Counselor	Collaborate with the leadership team and monitor daily attendance and incentives for students.
Murray, Juliet	Behavior Specialist	Collaborate with the leadership team and monitor PBIS, CHAMPS and behavior interventions.
Castanon, Rebecca	Other	Collaborate with the leadership team and monitor and facilitate Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions.
Lloyd, Carrie	Other	Collaborate with the leadership team and monitor and facilitate Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions.

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 meets monthly. All stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss goals and progress towards meeting these goals.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored regularly through collaboration and meetings with executive director as well as other principals. In addition, biweekly leadership team meetings as well as monthly FAC meetings will be used for ongoing monitoring.

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	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	89%
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	8	39	47	43	33	25	0	0	0	195	
One or more suspensions	1	6	4	10	18	5	0	0	0	44	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	13	8	23	0	0	0	0	0	44	
Course failure in Math	0	17	18	34	0	2	0	0	0	71	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	18	39	7	53	19	0	0	0	136	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	28	11	33	50	16	0	0	0	138	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	25	37	47	44	24	0	0	0	180	

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	3	37	49	56	65	26	0	0	0	236

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	53	48	48	50	43	51	0	0	0	293	
One or more suspensions	5	8	6	10	12	23	0	0	0	64	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	6	1	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	2	36	47	0	0	0	0	85	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	51	40	58	0	0	0	149	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	3	8	7	4	0	0	0	27	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	7	6	45	41	61	0	0	0	163

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	27	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	53	48	48	50	43	51	0	0	0	293	
One or more suspensions	5	8	6	10	12	23	0	0	0	64	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	6	1	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	2	36	47	0	0	0	0	85	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	51	40	58	0	0	0	149	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	3	8	7	4	0	0	0	27	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	7	6	45	41	61	0	0	0	163

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	27	0	0	0	0	0	27
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*	35	44	53	35	46	56	38		
ELA Learning Gains				48			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			17		
Math Achievement*	41	52	59	33	43	50	32		
Math Learning Gains				49			13		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			4		
Science Achievement*	51	49	54	41	50	59	26		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	41	58	59	34			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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	196
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40

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	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	28	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	4	
HSP	33	Yes	3	
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	37	Yes	4	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	36	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	3	
HSP	39	Yes	2	

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	36	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	39	Yes	3	

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	35			41			51					41
SWD	22			18			29				4	
ELL	20			34			35				5	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			34			50				4	
HSP	30			35			38				5	38
MUL	45			50							3	
PAC												
WHT	47			58			63				4	
FRL	32			39			47				5	40

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	35	48	36	33	49	45	41					34
SWD	23	43	38	19	33	22	14					20
ELL	27	43	31	30	51	41	33					34
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	32	52	37	25	44	48	41					27
HSP	32	43	38	32	47	47	40					33
MUL	36			36								
PAC												
WHT	43	47	30	45	59	36	42					
FRL	31	49	37	29	49	49	37					33

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	38	41	17	32	13	4	26					48
SWD	21	6	0	20	12		29					
ELL	28	38		28	14		26					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	31	17	28	8	0	18					56
HSP	30	38		25	13		14					43
MUL	69			62								
PAC												
WHT	45	58		40	16		42					
FRL	37	43	18	31	12	5	26					45

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	46%	-4%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	26%	42%	-16%	50%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	30%	52%	-22%	59%	-29%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	56%	1%	61%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	51%	-4%

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.

Our lowest performance data was in both ELA (27%) and Math (26%) in third grade. Additionally, overall, our ELA Proficiency (38%) was lower than our Math Proficiency (46%) in grades 3-5.

Contributing Factors:

Teacher Centered Instruction as opposed to Student Centered, Lack of knowledge in new standards and new curriculum, Low SES, Discipline and Attendance .

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

There were no declines in data from the prior year however our growth in Reading was not significant.

Overall, ELA Proficiency Grades 3-5, 38% as compared to 35%- 3 point increase

Overall, Math Proficiency Grades 3-5, 46% as compared to 33% - 13 point increase

5th Grade Science 51% as compared to 41% - 10 point increase

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

The greatest gap as compared to the state was in 3rd grade math proficiency.
Lakewood Park 31%
State 59%
Difference of 28%

Contributing Factors:

Teacher Centered Instruction as opposed to Student Centered, Lack of knowledge in new standards and new curriculum, Low SES, Discipline and Attendance. Lack of hands on and gradual release.

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 4th grade math, 59% proficient compared to 40% proficient, 19-point increase.

New Actions:

- New staff
- New team lead
- Data focused collaborative planning
- Small group instruction

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

Based on the EWS data, attendance overall is a area of concern as well as 4th grade achievement data in both reading and math.

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

1. Improve Student Attendance
2. To shift core instruction from a direct instruction model to teacher lead student groups then ultimately teacher facilitated/student-lead groups.
3. To move our Culture & Conditions from a level of Systems of Control to Self-Regulation & Student Ownership (School Instructional Maturity Model).
4. Increase Reading Proficiency
5. Increase Math Proficiency

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our 2022-2023 attendance data indicates that 31% of our student population falls into the category of chronic absenteeism. 12.20% (85 students) had 20-24 absences and 18.79% (131 students) had 25+ absences. Student attendance directly impacts student achievement. Our first job is to get students to want to be here and that starts with the overall culture and environment of our school community.

Lakewood Park has agreed upon the following Core Principles to drive our culture:

1. Champion for All (Never quit on yourself, student, or colleague)
2. Expect Excellence/Live Excellence (Model the behavior we expect)
3. Cultivate Positive Connections (Create meaningful experiences and be a positive voice)
4. Merchant of Hope (Believe that you have the power to inspire and make change)

Measurable Outcome:

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

To decrease the percentage of students with chronic absenteeism from 31% to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

- Development and implementation of school -based attendance action plan
- Monthly attendance meetings to monitor action plan
- Student & class incentives
- Phone calls/home visits
- Mentoring for students with chronic absences

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Monroe (lauren.monroe@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.)

- Utilizing the Toolkit, "Bringing Attendance Home", educate parents on the effects of chronic absences.
- Student & class incentives
- Mentoring/check in check out with chronically absent students
- Phone calls/home visits
- Refer chronically absent students to problem solving team
- Parent education through social media, monthly newsletter, parent teacher conferences, and academic events
- Communicate in various languages

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Parents and families are essential partners in promoting good attendance because ultimately it is their responsibility to get their child to school. It is the school's responsibility to equip our parents with the knowledge of the impact of attendance on student achievement. Schools have better attendance when they:

- orient parents on school policies and expectations
- communicate often
- reward students and classes for attendance

- make phone calls/home visits
- refer chronically absent student to PST

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.

Develop school-based action plan through iSucceed district initiative (which includes the 3 documents below):

Document 1- Smart Goal Lakewood Park Elementary will achieve an Average Daily Attendance (ADA) rate of (95%) or greater in the 2023-2024 school year.

Document 2 - Flow Chart (provides processes and procedures to monitor and intervene for attendance, includes a progression of intervention)

Document 3 - Attendance Pyramid (identifies each strategy/intervention implemented at each Tier)

Person Responsible: Dara Williams (dara.williams@stlucieschools.org)

By When: 9/1/23

-Communicate with staff school-based attendance campaign.

-Provide professional learning on the flowchart (Document 2 of the attendance iSucceed plan)

Person Responsible: Lauren Monroe (lauren.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August 31, 2023

Implement action plan.

- monthly attendance meetings
- biweekly class rewards
- phone call/home visits
- PST meetings

Person Responsible: Lauren Monroe (lauren.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our focus will be on improving Tier 1 instruction for all students. Our data indicates that 6 out of 7 subgroups scored below 41% and 1 subgroup scored 2 points above 41%:

SWD - 27%
ELL-36%
Black - 38%
Hispanic-39%
Multiracial- 36%
White- 43%
FRL- 39%

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect all subgroups to achieve at least 50% proficiency in the areas of both Reading and Math on PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through lesson plans, observation data, and progress monitoring student achievement data. Students will also use data trackers to monitor their own progress on unit assessments and district assessments. Regularly scheduled response to intervention meetings will focus on the monitoring of Tier 2 and Tier 3 data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Melrose (kathleen.melrose@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.)

The Framework for Quality Teaching and Learning focused on moving from a teacher centered classroom model to a student-centered classroom model, will be implemented to improve Tier 1 instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Improving Tier 1 instruction utilizing the Framework for Quality Teaching and Learning, will increase achievement for all subgroup areas.

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. Ongoing professional learning focused on the Framework for Quality Teaching and Learning (Standards - Based Planning, Standards-Based Instruction, Quality Conditions for Learning).

Person Responsible: Kathleen Melrose (kathleen.melrose@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Professional Learning Dates: 8/1, 8/2, 8/24, 9/13, 11/15, 1/18, & 2/28.

Strategic Monitoring of collaborative planning and lesson plan implementation.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Melrose (kathleen.melrose@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Coaching Cycles

Person Responsible: Charlene Carter (charlene.carter@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Beginning in October and continuing throughout the remainder of 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 improvement funding allocations are based on data. Data indicates the need to improve Tier 1 instruction. Our core leadership team consisting of Administration, Instructional Coaches, Interventionists, School Counselors, ESE Specialists, Behavior Specialists, and Team Leaders meet to prioritize school needs and budget planning. Input on resources is also through partnership with district Administrator on Special Assignment overseeing grants, working with district curriculum department to fund approved resources, partnering with Federal and Special Programs Manager for Title 1 to plan budgets as well as partnering 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

On the 2023 STAR PM 3, only 61% of kindergarten students, 53% of 1st grade students, and 43% of 2nd grade students were proficient. On the Spring 2023 i-Ready Reading Diagnostic, 54% of students in grades K-5 were proficient in phonics, 34% in vocabulary, and 39% in comprehension. An area of focus for K-2 this year is going to be on phonics instruction. With targeted skill-based instruction in phonics, students will leave K-2 classrooms with the foundational skills necessary to be fluent readers entering 3rd grade. When students enter 3rd grade without necessary foundational skills in reading, they are not prepared for success on their statewide assessments.

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

On the 2023 FAST PM 3, only 27% of 3rd grade students, 42% of 4th grade students, 46% of 5th grade students scored a Level 3 or higher. On the Spring 2023 i-Ready Reading Diagnostic, 54% of students in grades K-5 were proficient in phonics, 34% in vocabulary, and 39% in comprehension. AN area of focus for 3-5 this year is going to be on phonics and vocabulary instruction leading in to fluency and comprehension. With targeted skill-based instruction in phonics and vocabulary, students will leave 3-5 classrooms with the foundational skills necessary to perform at a proficient level on statewide assessments.

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

Overall, 54% of students exiting last year were proficient in phonics, 34% in vocabulary, and 39% in comprehension based on the Spring i-Ready Diagnostic. With targeted skill-based instruction, 70% of students will be proficient in phonics, 70% of students will be proficient in vocabulary, and 70% of students will be proficient in comprehension.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Overall, 54% of students exiting last year were proficient in phonics, 34% in vocabulary, and 39% in comprehension based on the Spring i-Ready Diagnostic. With targeted skill-based instruction, 80% of students will be proficient in phonics, 70% of students will be proficient in vocabulary, and 70% of students will be proficient in comprehension.

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.

The school's Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes through collection of data on formative assessments, District Unit Assessments, State Progress Monitors in Fall, Winter, and Spring, and teacher observations. Progress towards goals in our focus areas will be discussed with all

stakeholders in monthly SAC meetings, Faculty Advisory council meetings, MTSS response to intervention meetings, as well as grade level Collaborative Planning sessions and data chats.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Melrose, Kathleen, kathleen.melrose@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?

Teachers and Interventionists will provide support to students during the reading block using Heggerty, i-Ready and Benchmark Advance. Additional support during MTSS and reteach block will include instruction with Fountas and Pinnell Literacy, i-Ready, Reading Horizons, and LLI. The identified practices/programs will be monitored through weekly Literacy walks by administration and coaches and follow up in daily Collaborative Planning sessions.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The specific practices/programs described are evidence-based and have shown a record of effectiveness for all areas of focus. Criteria for selecting practices/programs were What Works Clearinghouse and John Hattie’s Visible Learning effect sizes.

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
Leadership training for all grade chairs and coaches focused on Collaborative Planning best practices, New Teacher support and lesson study on Engagement strategies, and Coaching cycles.	Monroe, Lauren, lauren.monroe@stlucieschools.org
Weekly literacy walkthroughs to provide feedback and support instruction	Melrose, Kathleen, kathleen.melrose@stlucieschools.org
Grouping students to receive targeted skill-based instruction based on needs during MTSS, small group instruction, and reteach blocks.	Castanon, Rebecca, rebecca.castanon@stlucieschools.org

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

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

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

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

The SIP will be reviewed and monitored as part of the agenda at each monthly SAC meeting. In addition, the information will be shared with parents at our annual Title 1 night. The school website will provide the completed plan and can be accessed at <https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/lwp/>.

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))

Important information is shared with families through the school website and Facebooks page. Parent Newsletters are sent home monthly and are posted in the front office as well. Each morning, announcements are streamed through Facebook Live so that all parents and community members can engage and give shout outs to students to start their day. School messenger and school marquee are

used to communicate important updates to families. Monthly academic/social events are added to the calendar to provide opportunities for families to gather and participate in events at the school. Skyward family access, parent teacher conferences, PST meetings, quarterly report cards, deficiency notices, and Tiered Instruction notifications are used to inform parents of their child's progress.

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

The school plans to focus on Tier 1 instruction as an Area of Focus. The school has included strategic Professional Learning for all staff in the areas of Collaborative Planning and the Framework for Quality Teaching and Learning. Quality teachers have a direct impact on student achievement.

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

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$7,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	311	0231 - Lakewood Park Elem. School	UniSIG		\$7,500.00
			<i>Notes: 3 days of professional learning for teachers and staff on culture and learning environment with outside consultant.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$84,213.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0231 - Lakewood Park Elem. School	UniSIG	0.5	\$21,500.00
			<i>Notes: Certified teacher - part time math interventionist to support tier 2 and 3 interventions for students identified as below grade level mastery. .5 FTE</i>			
	5100	210	0231 - Lakewood Park Elem. School	UniSIG		\$2,795.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement - calculated at 13.57% for part time math interventionist.</i>			
	5100	220	0231 - Lakewood Park Elem. School	UniSIG		\$1,644.75
			<i>Notes: FICA - calculated at 7.65% for part time math interventionist</i>			
	5100	240	0231 - Lakewood Park Elem. School	UniSIG		\$600.00

			<i>Notes: Workers' Comp - Benefit calculated at \$1200 per FTE, part time math interventionist .5 FTE = \$600.</i>			
	5100	510	0231 - Lakewood Park Elem. School	UniSIG		\$45,096.00
			<i>Notes: Top Score Writing Curriculum to supplement the core writing instruction for grades 2-5.</i>			
	6400	311	0231 - Lakewood Park Elem. School	UniSIG		\$12,500.00
			<i>Notes: 3 days of professional learning with an outside consultant for teachers on collaborative planning for benchmark and standards-based instruction.</i>			
	5100	510	0231 - Lakewood Park Elem. School	UniSIG		\$77.25
			<i>Notes: Supplies - data folders for teachers to track student writing</i>			
Total:						\$91,713.00

Budget Approval

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

No