

Florida Atlantic University - College of Education

FAU/SIcsd Palm Pointe Educational Research



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

FAU/Slcsd Palm Pointe Educational Research School @ Tradition

10680 SW ACADEMIC WAY, Port St Lucie, FL 34987

www.tradition.fau.edu

Demographics

Principal: Kathleen Perez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2016

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 52% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (67%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

FAU/Slcsd Palm Pointe Educational Research School @ Tradition

10680 SW ACADEMIC WAY, Port St Lucie, FL 34987

www.tradition.fau.edu

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School KG-8 | Yes | 51% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 62% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Through engaging, rigorous and differentiated quality instruction, Palm Pointe Educational Research School @ Tradition commits to a comprehensive, collaborative system of support for ALL students. This ensures that our Rockets are fully equipped for their next mission!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Palm Pointe Educational Research School @ Tradition, in partnership with parents and the community, will become a premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. Palm Pointe's name will be synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our school's promise is to move from good to great, focusing on the creation of challenging, engaging, and satisfying work for each student, every day.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Perez, Kathleen | Principal | |
| Hughes, Linda | Teacher, ESE | |
| Carvelli, Karol | Teacher, ESE | |
| Apostolico, Maurizio | Instructional Technology | |
| Larsen, Melanie | Instructional Coach | |
| Keelor, John | Assistant Principal | |
| Eshleman, Suzan | Other | |
| Koenig, Rachel | Assistant Principal | |
| Innamorato, Carmela | Instructional Coach | |
| Rowley, Tiffany | School Counselor | |
| Perry, Alison | Instructional Coach | |
| Apple, Angela | School Counselor | |
| Bois, Claudy | Dean | |
| Newsome, Annette | Assistant Principal | |
| Markowitz, Dana | Instructional Coach | |
| | | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/30/2016, Kathleen Perez

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

104

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 52% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (67%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 149 | 151 | 150 | 149 | 159 | 162 | 171 | 173 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1429 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 15 | 27 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 22 | 37 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 26 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/15/2020

Prior Year - 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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 144 | 147 | 147 | 151 | 159 | 156 | 169 | 174 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1405 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 38 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 29 | 47 | 18 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

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 | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year - 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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 144 | 147 | 147 | 151 | 159 | 156 | 169 | 174 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1405 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 38 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 29 | 47 | 18 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

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 | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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 | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 72% | 83% | 61% | 69% | 0% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 67% | 74% | 59% | 64% | 0% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 56% | 66% | 54% | 52% | 0% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 75% | 84% | 62% | 74% | 0% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 64% | 70% | 59% | 70% | 0% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 62% | 52% | 50% | 0% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 64% | 76% | 56% | 65% | 0% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 88% | 94% | 78% | 90% | 0% | 75% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

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 | 2019 | 71% | 77% | -6% | 58% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 73% | 0% | 57% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 75% | 79% | -4% | 58% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 69% | -5% | 56% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 65% | 71% | -6% | 56% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 73% | -5% | 55% | 13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 67% | 74% | -7% | 54% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 69% | -5% | 52% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 72% | 76% | -4% | 52% | 20% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 76% | 79% | -3% | 51% | 25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 82% | 84% | -2% | 56% | 26% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 86% | -4% | 58% | 24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 73% | 79% | -6% | 62% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 81% | 1% | 62% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 70% | 74% | -4% | 64% | 6% |
| | 2018 | 65% | 73% | -8% | 62% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 56% | 67% | -11% | 60% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 79% | -6% | 61% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 88% | 90% | -2% | 55% | 33% |
| | 2018 | 85% | 83% | 2% | 52% | 33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 77% | 79% | -2% | 54% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 83% | 0% | 54% | 29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 24% | 66% | -42% | 46% | -22% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 70% | -17% | 45% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -29% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 56% | 64% | -8% | 53% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 69% | -8% | 55% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 72% | 73% | -1% | 48% | 24% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 75% | -3% | 50% | 22% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 88% | 91% | -3% | 71% | 17% |
| 2018 | 86% | 89% | -3% | 71% | 15% |
| Compare | | 2% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 95% | 94% | 1% | 61% | 34% |
| 2018 | 95% | 94% | 1% | 62% | 33% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | 0% | 100% | -100% | 56% | -56% |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 32 | 57 | 52 | 46 | 49 | 44 | 14 | 76 | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 45 | 50 | 65 | 69 | 50 | | | | | |
| ASN | 81 | 81 | | 88 | 76 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 73 | 67 | 62 | 69 | 58 | 42 | 55 | 92 | 95 | | |

| 2019 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| HSP | 72 | 69 | 52 | 73 | 60 | 47 | 62 | 87 | 95 | | |
| MUL | 69 | 67 | 42 | 80 | 69 | | 53 | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 65 | 58 | 77 | 67 | 49 | 68 | 85 | 93 | | |
| FRL | 68 | 66 | 58 | 71 | 60 | 45 | 60 | 86 | 88 | | |
| 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 | 23 | 44 | 42 | 41 | 60 | 57 | 27 | 40 | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 47 | 36 | 59 | 65 | 50 | | | | | |
| ASN | 88 | 64 | | 100 | 86 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 66 | 70 | 64 | 72 | 73 | 60 | 59 | 93 | 100 | | |
| HSP | 72 | 72 | 59 | 79 | 75 | 63 | 68 | 79 | 91 | | |
| MUL | 73 | 71 | | 85 | 74 | | 77 | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 64 | 50 | 79 | 73 | 62 | 65 | 87 | 92 | | |
| FRL | 67 | 68 | 58 | 74 | 73 | 63 | 59 | 84 | 93 | | |
| 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 | 27 | 51 | 45 | 38 | 48 | 43 | 22 | 80 | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 55 | | 57 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 95 | 93 | | 84 | 80 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 65 | 62 | 51 | 63 | 64 | 50 | 50 | 88 | 71 | | |
| HSP | 70 | 63 | 50 | 76 | 71 | 51 | 65 | 89 | 68 | | |
| MUL | 64 | 58 | 40 | 67 | 64 | 58 | 43 | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 66 | 55 | 78 | 71 | 48 | 73 | 92 | 79 | | |
| FRL | 63 | 60 | 50 | 67 | 65 | 48 | 54 | 87 | 66 | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 68 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 49 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 675 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 46 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 53 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 82 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 68 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 67 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 63 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|--|-----|
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 70 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 66 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was learning gains for students in the lowest 25th percentile in math (47%). This could be attributed to staffing issues, lack of small group instructional practices/structure, and not reteaching targets in the time between testing and retesting, to gauge whether students have retained the concepts.

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

Data components in all subject areas in fifth grade - proficiency and gains - showed the greatest decline from the prior year. This could be attributed to fewer opportunities for students to practice skills related to standards/targets, and not as much of a regularly used structure for small group instruction and reteach opportunities.

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.

Eighth grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (24% to 46%). This could be attributed to concerns related to staffing, relationship-building, differentiation, and reteach opportunities.

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

Fourth grade ELA proficiency and gains showed the most improvement. The team was comprised of strong teachers who worked collaboratively to plan engaging, rigorous instruction and believed in the power of building relationships with students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One area of concern from the EWS data is the performance of SWD at 46%.

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

1. Bottom quartile learning gains
2. Fifth grade proficiency and learning gains in Math and ELA; proficiency in Science
3. Eighth grade Math proficiency and learning gains
4. SWD proficiency and learning gains
5. Social-Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Teachers are continuing to deepen their knowledge of how to design and implement data-driven differentiated instruction with accountability, aligned to the depth and rigor of the Florida Standards. Although Palm Pointe predicted high academic achievement in both ELA and Math, the school was not projected to achieve its goals for overall Math proficiency and Math/ELA learning gains during the 2019-2020 school year. Looking at grade-specific scores, and teacher and parent feedback, it is evident that teachers need continued development in designing instruction based on data which targets specific student needs and maximizes instructional time. If teachers can easily access and interpret student performance data, then they will be better equipped to identify students' targeted instructional needs, and better able to provide students with concrete feedback related to their strengths and areas of growth. Teachers will have the necessary data and skill to implement differentiated instructional practices and organize small group instruction. Teachers will also be able to guide students in setting goals and tracking progress, improving academic accountability over time.

Measurable Outcome: Student performance on end-of-year FSA, SSA, EOC, and FSAA assessments will each increase by at least three percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Perez (kathleen.perez@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Strategies will include: data-driven instruction, data analysis, teacher collaborative planning/learning, and formative assessment/feedback opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If teachers can easily access and interpret student performance data, then they will be better equipped to identify students' targeted instructional needs, and better able to provide students with concrete feedback related to their strengths and areas of growth. Teachers will have the necessary data and skill to implement differentiated instructional practices and organize small group instruction. Teachers will also be able to guide students in setting goals and tracking progress, improving academic accountability over time. Professional development needs survey feedback, student achievement data, and observational results were used to make this determination.

Action Steps to Implement

- o The school will involve teachers in ongoing data analysis to inform instruction, as evidenced by lagging state assessment data, i-Ready results, School Pace progress, unit assessments scores, etc.
- o The school will designate windows and provide resources to administer assessments and examine student assessment outcomes.
- o Throughout the school year, the school will facilitate collaborative learning sessions and professional development opportunities geared toward differentiation practices.
- o The school will utilize various funding sources to provide professional development sessions, resources, and/or coverage for learning, planning, and assessment analysis purposes.
- o Teachers will provide timely, actionable feedback and guide students in tracking progress from formative assessments including goal-setting and communicating individual achievement.
- o The school will provide teachers with professional learning and support focused on formative assessments and engaging in the feedback cycle, as well as resources for teachers and students to track progress toward learning goals.

Person Responsible

Kathleen Perez (kathleen.perez@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School-wide understanding and implementation of social-emotional learning is inconsistent across grade levels, classrooms, and in both traditional and virtual settings. If students have more purposeful social-emotional learning experiences and instruction, then they will be able to effectively manage and apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand their emotions, feel and show empathy, maintain positive relationships, and cope with challenges, resulting in classroom environments more conducive to tolerance, multiple viewpoints, and focus on learning.

Measurable Outcome: The number of discipline referrals will decrease by 25% or more. Results of the 20-21 Panorama Student Survey will improve in the area of Emotional Regulation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Rowley (tiffany.rowley@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony/Lions Quest will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated in both virtual and traditional settings to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class and virtual observations using corresponding walk-through tools. An SEL committee will promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students are lacking many of these basic life and emotional skills needed for success in school, at home, in the community, and in our current world. Intentional focus on cultivating SEL competencies is a proven strategy used to reduce discipline concerns, increase attendance, and develop positive learning communities.

Action Steps to Implement

- o The school will work to broaden its understanding and implementation of social-emotional learning competencies in both traditional and virtual learning environments through professional development, supportive resources, and restorative practices.
- o The school's Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) committee will provide teachers with training, support, and resources to build teachers' knowledge of the five social-emotional learning competencies and their ability to implement activities across learning settings, such as daily community circles, along with specific targeted social-emotional learning experiences.

Person Responsible Tiffany Rowley (tiffany.rowley@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As students and staff adapt to new teaching and learning environments, teachers need further support in providing rigorous, engaging instruction in virtual and “new” traditional settings. The inclusion of the virtual learning option and guidelines now in place in the traditional setting are impacting the teaching and learning process. If teachers can deliver engaging, rigorous lessons with fidelity across both virtual and traditional platforms, then students will achieve their academic goals.

Measurable Outcome: Student performance on end-of-year FSA, SSA, EOC, and FSAA assessments will each increase by at least three percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathleen Perez (kathleen.perez@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies will include: standards-based planning and instruction, data analysis, and teacher collaborative planning/learning opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers can deliver engaging, rigorous lessons with fidelity across both virtual and traditional platforms, then students will achieve their academic goals.

Action Steps to Implement

- o The school will provide teachers with professional learning and support focused on technology, virtual instructional strategies, and in-person instructional techniques that would be considered “safe” in the traditional setting, as well as related resources.
- o The school will assist in preparing teachers and students for potential transitions to virtual environments from traditional settings.
- o The school will support teachers in the collaborative planning process, ensuring that instructional units and daily lessons complement both settings, embed formative assessment strategies, engage students, and are aligned to the depth of the targeted standard(s).

Person Responsible Kathleen Perez (kathleen.perez@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Our schoolwide improvement priorities will be addressed through Areas of Focus 1, 2, and 3.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Palm Pointe is committed to providing a positive and welcoming environment for students, staff, parents, and school stakeholders. The school infuses principles of growth mindset in teaching and learning for both staff and students as part of the core culture. Students and staff are further provided opportunities for Social Emotional Learning within the daily schedule and as part of the adopted curriculum. Palm Pointe also utilizes PBIS for developing and maintaining a culture committed to positive personal growth and restorative justice. The effectiveness of these measures is monitored through the administration of periodic climate and culture surveys for employees as well as an SEL-specific survey completed by students. Both SEL and PBIS implementation is also overseen by school-based committees comprised of faculty members. Additionally, parents and school stakeholders are given multiple methods for providing feedback on the school's culture, through participation on the School Advisory Committee (SAC), completion of exit surveys at school events, and an annual parent satisfaction survey. Under the guidance of SAC and the faculty council, the school develops a Parent and Family Engagement Plan each year to address school-home communication and family involvement. Teachers and instructional staff plan and facilitate engaging, structured events to provide families with information about what students are learning at school and strategies for supporting learning at home. The school also uses consistent communication methods to keep families informed, including weekly grade level newsletters, social media, ConnectEd phone calls, a monthly parent newsletter, and the school website.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | | | | \$1,000.00 |
|---|----------|---|--|--------------------------|-----|------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6300 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0020 - FAU/Slcsd Palm Pointe Research School | School Improvement Funds | | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Looking at grade-specific scores, and teacher and parent feedback, it is evident that teachers need continued development in designing instruction based on data which targets specific student needs and maximizes instructional time. If teachers can easily access and interpret student performance data, then they will be better equipped to identify students' targeted instructional needs, and better able to provide students with concrete feedback related to their strengths and areas of growth. Teachers will have the necessary data and skill to implement differentiated instructional practices and organize small group instruction.</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|--|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| | | <i>Teachers will also be able to guide students in setting goals and tracking progress, improving academic accountability over time.</i> | | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | \$2,886.27 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0020 - FAU/Slcsd Palm Pointe Research School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,886.27 |
| | | <i>Notes: If students have more purposeful social-emotional learning experiences and instruction, then they will be able to effectively manage and apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand their emotions, feel and show empathy, maintain positive relationships, and cope with challenges, resulting in classroom environments more conducive to tolerance, multiple viewpoints, and focus on learning.</i> | | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning | | | | \$2,886.27 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0020 - FAU/Slcsd Palm Pointe Research School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,886.27 |
| | | <i>Notes: If teachers can deliver engaging, rigorous lessons with fidelity across both virtual and traditional platforms, then students will achieve their academic goals.</i> | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$6,772.54 |