St. Lucie Public Schools

Creative Arts Academy Of St. Lucie

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 3

School Information 4

Needs Assessment 6

Planning for Improvement 10

Title I Requirements 11

Budget to Support Goals 13

Creative Arts Academy Of St. Lucie

1100 DELAWARE AVE, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/cast/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

Year	**2017-18**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2014-15**
Grade	C	C	C	C*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Lucie County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of the Creative Arts Academy of St. Lucie is to prepare students for a successful future through academic excellence, creativity, and an understanding and appreciation of the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Creative Arts Academy of St. Lucie will create an engaging and enjoyable culture where students are provided with the necessary skills that will cause them to excel to the top in all areas of the academics and the arts. As students acquire these skills, they will broaden their perspectives as well as adhere to a healthier approach to life. Once these skills are obtained, students will be prepared then to be accepted to the colleges/universities of their choice, to be successful at those institutions of higher learning, and to become a successful and productive member of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Reid, Lori Anne	Principal
Gavoni, Vincia	Assistant Principal
Mihajlovski, Virginia	Teacher, K-12
Lee, Matthew	Teacher, K-12
Rampone, Brittany	
Johnson, James	Instructional Coach
Smith, Felicia	Instructional Coach
Aaron.Barnes@sltucieschools.org, Barnes	Teacher, K-12
McMahon, Paige	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Function:
To oversee the entire process and delivery of instructional practices serving as interventions/ enrichment to ensure that all students are provided time/opportunity towards mastering grade level standards.
Responsibility:
1. Monitor data collection.
2. Host bi-monthly meetings with teachers to review data.
3. Provide instructional materials to support student deficiencies.
4. Determine cut points in deciding if a student will move up, down, or remain in their current tier.
5. Monitor classroom instruction and provide feedback to instructional staff on instructional practices.
6. Support a multi tiered system of support for students and teachers.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	0	1	4	3	13	6	5	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	3	4	10	9	12	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	9	17	20	17	12	0	0	0	0	78

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Thursday 8/23/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	16	7	5	9	5	7	8	11	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	7	8	4	3	10	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	21	35	43	27	27	0	0	0	0	161
Retentions	0	0	4	9	11	15	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	2	1	9	19	21	8	20	20	0	0	0	0	100

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	16	7	5	9	5	7	8	11	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	7	8	4	3	10	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	21	35	43	27	27	0	0	0	0	161
Retentions	0	0	4	9	11	15	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	2	1	9	19	21	8	20	20	0	0	0	0	100

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Science Proficiency was the lowest at 27%. 8th grade 34% and 5th grade 20%. This seems to be a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Civics showed the greatest decline. From 67% to 48% (-19%)

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Science showed the biggest gap when compared to the state average at total of 26% points.
The largest gap was in 5th grade.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Middle School Acceleration is the most improved. This is a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Targeted professional development, all level 3,4,or 5 students are enrolled in accelerated courses.

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	57%	60%	39%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	57%	57%	51%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	55%	52%	57%	49%	49%
Math Achievement	41%	58%	61%	45%	49%	56%
Math Learning Gains	37%	57%	58%	54%	53%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	51%	52%	48%	47%	48%
Science Achievement	27%	56%	57%	44%	44%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	48%	74%	77%	58%	65%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (5)	3 (16)	0 (7)	1 (5)	4 (9)	3 (5)	13 (7)	6 (8)	5 (11)	36 (73)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)	4 (4)	3 (7)	4 (8)	10 (4)	9 (3)	12 (10)	43 (39)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (2)	3 (8)	8 (10)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (8)	9 (21)	17 (35)	20 (43)	17 (27)	12 (27)	78 (161)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	27%	46%	-19%	57%	-30%
	2017	37%	49%	-12%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
	2017	26%	50%	-24%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2018	24%	49%	-25%	55%	-31%
	2017	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2018	26%	47%	-21%	52%	-26%
	2017	46%	48%	-2%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
07	2018	50%	48%	2%	51%	-1%
	2017	46%	46%	0%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2018	58%	54%	4%	58%	0%
	2017	43%	50%	-7%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
	2017	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	49%	57%	-8%	62%	-13%
	2017	20%	56%	-36%	64%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	17%	55%	-38%	61%	-44%
	2017	67%	48%	19%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-50%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2018	28%	46%	-18%	52%	-24%
	2017	31%	48%	-17%	51%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
07	2018	40%	49%	-9%	54%	-14%
	2017	57%	47%	10%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2018	33%	35%	-2%	45%	-12%
	2017	10%	40%	-30%	46%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2018	20%	50%	-30%	55%	-35%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	34%	48%	-14%	50%	-16%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		34%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	47%	71%	-24%	71%	-24%
2017	70%	69%	1%	69%	1%
Compare		-23%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	70%	54%	16%	62%	8%
2017	67%	69%	-2%	60%	7%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	16	42	38	10	20	16					
ELL	12	43	47	35	40	30					
BLK	33	50	50	35	30	27	22	39			
HSP	41	53	33	49	51	58	21	50			
MUL	46	83		38	15						
WHT	50	69	64	44	44		40				
FRL	37	55	47	39	37	31	26	44	64		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	6	30	31	19	59	50					

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
ELL	10	38	60	25	50	55	8				
BLK	38	50	52	41	50	55	32	78	60		
HSP	37	49	45	41	47	50	45	55			
MUL	46			46							
WHT	45	61	80	55	56		58	67			
FRL	40	52	56	44	51	49	43	65	64		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	To improve effective standards based instruction in Science
Rationale	Science showed the largest gap and when compared to students who were proficient in ELA, 47% for current students on campus, there is an opportunity for growth. Our new current student population shows a 49% proficiency in ELA.
Intended Outcome	By May 2018, at least 50% of our students in grades 5 and 8 will score a level 3 or higher as measured by the FL Statewide Science Assessment.
Point Person	Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)
Action Step	
Description	Utilize the Cambridge International Science Program incorporating a hands on approach to scientific learning; along with the district scope and sequence to focus on standards based instruction meeting the intent of the FL NGSSS Science Standards. Teachers will plan collaboratively to design lessons, hand on labs and assessments that meet the intent of the FL NGSSS Science Standards.
Person Responsible	Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Unit assessment data will be collected and analyzed. Administrators, coaches and other teachers will conduct curriculum sweeps that are not part of the SLPS evaluation system. They will be looking for 1) Is the instruction focused on the intent of the standard? 2) Is the instruction on pace with the focus calendars? 3) Is the instruction meeting the level of complexity for the standard? 4) Are the instructional materials being used aligned to the state standards.
Person Responsible	Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)

Activity #2	
Title	To improve Standards based instruction in Civics
Rationale	There was a 31% difference between our students and the state, CAST scoring 48% proficient in Civics as compared to the state scoring 77% proficient.
Intended Outcome	By May of 2019, 73% of students in 7th grade will score a level 3 or above as measured by the FL Civics End-of-Course Exam.
Point Person	Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)
Action Step	
Description	Teacher will plan collaboratively with district personnel and school interventionist. Teacher will utilize the SLPS scope and sequence to plan and implement standards based Civics lessons. Teacher will use Document Based Questioning, (DBQ) Utilize supplemental Gateway to American Government text.
Person Responsible	Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Unit assessment data will be collected and analyzed. Administrators, coaches and other teachers will conduct curriculum sweeps that are not part of the SLPS evaluation system. They will be looking for 1) Is the instruction focused on the intent of the standard? 2) Is the instruction on pace with the focus calendars? 3) Is the instruction meeting the level of complexity for the standard? 4) Are the instructional materials being used aligned to the state standards.
Person Responsible	Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

1. Provide parental involvement sessions for:
a. Assessments and grade level expectations
Parents will have an opportunity to participate in meetings and/or student sessions to learn about Unit assessments, District/State Assessments. The district website will be reviewed to provide opportunities for parents/guardians to learn about manipulating the SLC website to access student information for scope/sequence, progress reports, current state mandated updates.
b. School Advisory Council
SAC will meet once a month with 51% community member representation. The focus of community building and student achievement will support classroom/school wide initiatives of supporting the arts/

academics.
c. School wide celebrations
1. Classroom academic achievements of meeting behavior/academic goals.
2. Reduction in referrals
3. Increase in student attendance
4. Student performances each quarter

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Students identified based on high referral counts or Behavior Incident Reports are paired with an instructional coach that mentor them through the check in and check out system and "lunch bunch" opportunities. The mentor provides small group lunch opportunities that allows students to sit separately with the mentor and friends. Topics of positive support are identified and students share their thoughts and feelings about the topic of choice. Student Services Council is being consulted to provide support meetings for families in school and also outside of school in recommended family counseling sessions.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Families are provided informational sessions to participate in sessions presented in local high schools to support their high school choice selection at the end of the year including information on behavioral, academic, and social expectations. The St. Lucie County website provides various informational resources to support families and children transitioning into kindergarten and high school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The MTSS process:
1. Identify all data sources: FCAT 2.0, FSA Unit Assessments, iReady, Comprehensives, Formative/ Summative Assessments, Teacher Anecdotal notes, Attendance Records, Prior Student Records, ESE status, ESOL assessments, and Behavior Intervention Plans.
2. Identify current level of performance of each student.
3. Students leveled by grade level, not by individual teacher.
4. Identify lowest 20 percent of students and identify needs up to 30 percent.
5. Review deficiencies and determine if true deficiencies identified or core content concerns.
6. Match deficiencies to interventions.
7. Determine instructor to deliver intervention.
8. Tier II/Tier III interventions assessed every 10/5 days respectively.
9. Collective data meetings every two weeks to determine intervention effectiveness on group and individual.
10. Tracked/graphed data review after sequence of time will determine if student remains in current tier or
moves up or down a tier.
The Creative Arts Academy of St. Lucie is a Title I school . Our free/reduced lunch rate is approximately 84%. We utilize our Title I funds to provide professional development, supplemental materials and fund three high quality instructional coaches. These coaches provide classroom-embedded support,

professional development and coaching for all teachers. Students identified as migrant receive services and are offered tutorial sessions.
The Creative Arts Academy of St. Lucie "Kids at Hope School" wherein students self-esteem and self-worth are fostered through support and mentoring by a student's "Ace", or adult mentor. Positive Behavior Supports dovetail with our Kids at Hope program to support our students and promote positive behaviors. These programs are partially funded with federal dollars, as well.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

The Creative Arts Academy of St. Lucie is a new performing arts school. Students are able to express themselves through their creativity through the arts and thrive in their selected areas of interest. The school partners with local agencies to allow students to explore authentic arts experiences.

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$3,700.00**