Florida Atlantic University - College of Education

FAU/SIcsd Palm Pointe Educational Research School @ Tradition

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	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	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	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	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	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	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
			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.			

			Teachers will also be able to guide students in setting goals and tracking progress, improving academic accountability over time.			
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
			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.			
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
			Notes: If teachers can deliver engaging, rigorous lessons with fidelity across both virtual and traditional platforms, then students will achieve their academic goals.			
					Total:	**$6,772.54**