

St. Lucie Public Schools

Dale Cassens Education Complex



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Dale Cassens Education Complex

1901 S 11TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/dcs/>

Demographics

Principal: Gerald Earley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2005

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: F (17%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Dale Cassens Education Complex

1901 S 11TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/dcs/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Alternative Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

<p>Year</p>	<p>2015-16</p>	<p>2011-12</p>
<p>Grade</p>	<p>F</p>	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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 Dale Cassens Education Complex is to ensure all students graduate from safe and caring schools, equipped with the knowledge, skills, and the desire to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision from all stakeholders is to maintain an environment where all students feel safe. Through a Multi-tiered System of Support, we are committed to providing each student with an individual plan for academic and behavioral success. We will provide mental health and substance abuse/intervention counseling as well as academic counseling as needed. All teachers will know the needs of each student and plan for rigorous instruction. Each student will know what they need to accomplish in order to graduate and as a team with staff, students, parents and our community, they will graduate from their zoned schools with a post graduation plan.

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
Harden, Ellen	Principal	Provide strategic direction for the school by: Instructional leadership and maintaining a safe environment for all stakeholders. Manage budget. Design professional development, monitor all data, plan, implement, evaluate all academic objectives and goals and behavioral data. Liaison with community agencies. Staff/Personnel hire and evaluate. Parent involvement facilitator.
Bayless-Natta, Wendi	Other	As a Graduation Coach, she will monitor student academic progress and all graduation requirements for each student to graduate on time. Communicate with student, family and staff to ensure correct courses are taken, assessments are completed, gpa is monitored, credits are attained for promotion and graduation.
Moore, Larry	School Counselor	Listen to students' concerns about academic and SEL needs, assist with college and career readiness, PST, ELL monitoring and assessment, creates student schedules based on needs, monitors grades. Communicates with students, parents, staff as needed. Completes documents as requested by students/parents. Assists with assessments and monitoring for ELL and 504 students. Part of the Threat Assessment Team.
Johnson, Jeffrey	Teacher, K-12	Coordinates all assessments local and state for all students grades K12.
Griffin, Priscilla	Teacher, K-12	Creates lesson plans based on content standards with the rigor outlined by the scope and sequence of all core content. Delivers lessons to meet each students needs based on IEP, ELL, 504,etc. Delivers content to all learners style of learning, monitors progress and provides data to administration and parents. Creates and reinforces school-wide and classroom expectations and prepares students for standardized testing.
Coppola, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	Instruction academic coach, models academic lesson design and lesson delivery for optimal student comprehension. Works directly with teachers. Uses Get Better Faster as a guide for advancing teachers instructional delivery and classroom management. Is the liaison for all core content by attending district core PD and providing training and content knowledge to all teachers.
Alberti, Jaime	Assistant Principal	Enforce attendance, meet with parents to discuss and plan, school facilities, Professional development, work with teachers - monitor and evaluate.
Martin, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	Creates lesson plans based on content standards with the rigor outlined by the scope and sequence of all core content. Delivers lessons to meet each students needs based on IEP, ELL, 504,etc. Delivers content to all learners style of learning, monitors progress and provides data to administration and parents. Creates and reinforces school-wide and classroom expectations and prepares students for standardized testing.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
House, Michael	Dean	Conduct Counselors monitor student behaviors, communicate to parents, work with individual and groups of students for SEL needs, PBIS facilitators, monitors interventions and supports, presents data to administrators and meets with parents as needed.
Feldman, Jon	Dean	Conduct Counselors monitor student behaviors, communicate to parents, work with individual and groups of students for SEL needs, PBIS facilitators, monitors interventions and supports, presents data to administrators and meets with parents as needed.
Jackson, LaKeitha	Assistant Principal	Enforce attendance, meet with parents to discuss and plan, school facilities, Professional development, work with teachers - monitor and evaluate.
Simon, Angie	Teacher, ESE	Creates lesson plans based on content standards with the rigor outlined by the scope and sequence of all core content. Delivers lessons to meet each students needs based on IEP. Delivers content to all learners style of learning, monitors progress and provides data to administration and parents. Creates and reinforces school-wide and classroom expectations and prepares students for Florida Assessments as applicable to their IEP.
Viciere, Julia	Teacher, ESE	Creates lesson plans based on content standards with the rigor outlined by the scope and sequence of all core content. Delivers lessons to meet each students needs based on IEP. Delivers content to all learners style of learning, monitors progress and provides data to administration and parents. Creates and reinforces school-wide and classroom expectations and prepares students for Florida Assessments as applicable to their IEP.
Burns, Charity	Teacher, K-12	Creates lesson plans based on content standards with the rigor outlined by the scope and sequence of all core content. Delivers lessons to meet each students needs based on IEP, ELL, 504,etc. Delivers content to all learners style of learning, monitors progress and provides data to administration and parents. Creates and reinforces school-wide and classroom expectations and prepares students for standardized testing.
Jackson, DeRhonda	Dean	Conduct Counselor - duties to work with students, parents, staff on increasing academic performance and decreasing negative behaviors. Monitors data.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2005, Gerald Earley

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: F (17%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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	0	0	1	2	5	11	9	29	56	9	17	27	34	200
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	7	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	25	4	2	1	0	34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/16/2020

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	0	1	0	7	7	10	11	29	100	20	29	29	31	274
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	36	3	4	11	9	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	41	6	8	10	5	94
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	52	11	7	20	15	136

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	0	0	10	14	48	6	7	13	9	107

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	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	20	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	21	2	0	2	0	36

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	0	1	0	7	7	10	11	29	100	20	29	29	31	274
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	36	3	4	11	9	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	41	6	8	10	5	94
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	52	11	7	20	15	136

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	0	0	10	14	48	6	7	13	9	107

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	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	20	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	21	2	0	2	0	36

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	0%	60%	61%	0%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	50%	54%	0%	52%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	58%	62%	0%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	55%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	52%	0%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	58%	56%	0%	50%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	74%	78%	0%	74%	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	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	50%	-50%	58%	-58%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
	2018	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-41%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
06	2019	0%	51%	-51%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	9%	49%	-40%	52%	-43%
	2018	6%	48%	-42%	51%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	11%	54%	-43%	56%	-45%
	2018	17%	54%	-37%	58%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
09	2019	15%	54%	-39%	55%	-40%
	2018	15%	52%	-37%	53%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2019	18%	51%	-33%	53%	-35%
	2018	6%	52%	-46%	53%	-47%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	54%	-54%	64%	-64%
	2018	29%	57%	-28%	62%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	47%	-47%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	6%	50%	-44%	54%	-48%
	2018	24%	49%	-25%	54%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	7%	34%	-27%	46%	-39%
	2018	18%	35%	-17%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	46%	-46%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	14%	48%	-34%	48%	-34%
	2018	16%	48%	-32%	50%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	16%	71%	-55%	67%	-51%
2018	14%	67%	-53%	65%	-51%
Compare		2%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	12%	67%	-55%	71%	-59%
2018	49%	71%	-22%	71%	-22%
Compare		-37%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	20%	68%	-48%	70%	-50%
2018	13%	63%	-50%	68%	-55%
Compare		7%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	15%	51%	-36%	61%	-46%
2018	27%	54%	-27%	62%	-35%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	55%	-41%	57%	-43%
2018	14%	50%	-36%	56%	-42%
Compare		0%			

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	24	42		19	9						
ELL											
BLK	21	30		27							
HSP											
FRL										8	
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	19
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	15
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	114
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	15
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	18
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - 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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	7
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Our incoming student data reflects the following from their last FSA ELA assessment: 92.86 percent of students are Level 1 and 7.14 percent are Level 2. There are no level 3 or higher student scores. FSA Math assessment for Algebra I is 100 percent Level 1. Our SEL survey data reflects the lowest scored element to be A Sense of Belonging by students from last year's survey in grades 6-12, whereas for grades K-5 it was one of the highest. K-5 data reflects a need to target verbal and physical aggression, basic reading skills (phonemic awareness) and reading comprehension.

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

ELA - Integration of Knowledge and Ideas.

Factors that contribute to this decline include the lack of background knowledge our students bring with them in all core areas.

According to Robert Marzano, "What students already know about the content is one of the strongest indicators of how well they will learn new information relative to the content" (2004, p. 1). John Guthrie is equally adamant as he writes about comprehension as impossible without prior knowledge (2008, p. 11), and the National Research Council states definitively, "All learning involves transfer from previous experiences. Even initial learning involves transfer that is based on previous experiences and prior knowledge" (2000, p. 236).

Mathematics all areas - Algebra and Modeling, Functions, and Statistics. The same holds true for success in math - students must have a basic foundation of the core content in order to move to more complex skills required in Algebra and beyond.

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.

There will be larger than normal gaps in student learning after our extended virtual instruction last quarter. Since we suspended FSA, other measures were used to determine gaps in student learning. Prior year data indicate gaps across all grade levels in ELA and mathematics strands. With these gaps, diagnosis of what students currently know will need to be determined in order for teachers to plan strategies and determine the appropriate tools to differentiate instruction and close gaps, particularly in reading comprehension and mathematics skills development.

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

Most improved areas were found in ELA Language and Editing and Text-based Writing. This was due to a specific writing plan to include all teachers across all content with training in the writing model, practice writing prompts each quarter, and focused collaboration among ELA teachers.

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

1. Retentions - developing basic skills/background knowledge in ELA and Math content
2. Social emotional learning for students and staff
3. EWS subgroup data reflect the following subgroups do not meet proficiency: SWD, FRL, Black, White, Hispanic.

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

1. English Language Arts all grade levels. Including Reading K5 strategies and PD. Include subgroups: Black, Hispanic, White, FRL, SWD.
2. Mathematics all grade levels. Include subgroups: Black, Hispanic, White, FRL, SWD.
3. Social Emotional Learning all grade levels.
4. Attendance both live and virtual.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

ELA lagging data reflect 100% (92.86 % Level 1 and 7.14 % Level 2) of students have a great need for support and intensive remediation in this content area. By grade level bands, elementary students lack basic skills in reading and decoding (phonemic awareness). Teachers lack the understanding of how to teach a child to read; many teachers lack the knowledge needed to help students create strong connections that facilitate successful reading, many students have wiring that isn't connected properly. Students compensate by making any connections they can, but these are usually inefficient and intermittent. Specific training of teachers using Reading Horizons will ensure that teachers will develop the skills needed to overcome these gaps. For secondary students, they have learned to compensate for lack of prerequisite skills in reading. Focusing on diagnosing these gaps and working in minute increments and practicing both fluency and comprehension strategies will build stronger reading foundations. Close reading strategies will be explicitly taught with an emphasis on building background knowledge across all content but using a "just enough - or bit by bit" model (chunking/processing) so that students can absorb the content on a deeper level.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA learning gains will be measured by STAR Renaissance Diagnostic and Progress monitoring tool. Student Growth Percentile (SGP) is determined by first calculating growth between current test scores and up to two previous scores, then comparing that calculation to the growth of academic peers. Student Growth Percentile (SGP) is a measure of growth between a pre- and posttest, relative to the growth made by other students in the same grade with the same pretest score. It is a simple and effective way for educators to interpret student growth rate relative to that of his or her academic peers nationwide. SGPs, which were derived from growth norms, range from 1–99, with lower numbers representing lower relative growth and high numbers representing higher relative growth. Each time a student completes a Star assessment, an SGP is generated. Goal: By June 2021 all students will demonstrate growth in reading by increasing their score on the STAR Reading assessment (which assesses multiple FSA reading standards) in the following manner: Subgroup (A) Students who demonstrated they are at/above benchmark as indicated on the STAR reading assessment in the fall will increase their percentile rank to at least 50 percentile or improve on their personal percentile rank (whichever is greater) in the spring. Subgroup (B): Students who scored in the “on watch” category (between 26-39 percentile rank) will grow by at least one level towards meeting the standard to the “at/above benchmark category (above 40 percentile rank). Subgroup (C) Students who scored in the "intervention" category(between 11-24 percentile rank) on STAR in the fall will grow by at least one level towards meeting the standard to the “on watch” category (between 26-39 percentile rank) Subgroup (D) Students who scored in the "urgent intervention” category (below 10 percentile rank) on STAR in the fall will grow by at least one level towards meeting the standard to the intervention category (between 11-24 percentile rank)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ellen Harden (ellen.harden@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The computer-adaptive STAR Assessments are highly rated for reliability and validity by key federal groups, such as the National Center on Intensive Intervention, the National Center on Response to Intervention, and the National Center on Student Progress Monitoring. In 2012, STAR Assessments were highly rated for progress monitoring by the federally funded National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), whose mission is “to build state

and district capacity to support educators in using data-based individualization to effectively implement intensive interventions in reading, mathematics, and behavior in Grades K–12” (<http://www.intensiveintervention.org>), in the organization’s first review of progress-monitoring tools.

Earlier, in 2009, the U.S. Department of Education began funding the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI), whose mission is “to provide technical assistance to states and districts and building the capacity of states to assist districts in implementing proven models for RTI/EIS” (www.rti4success.org). That same year, STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and STAR Math were among the first assessments highly rated by the NCRTI for screening and progress monitoring. In subsequent reviews, STAR Assessments have maintained strong ratings, meaning they fulfill both these key elements of a school’s RTI framework. For information on using STAR Enterprise assessments in intervention settings, see Pupose and Frequency, p. 28.

STAR Assessments have received high marks as tools for Response to Intervention since 2006 when the NCRTI’s predecessor, the National Center on Student Progress Monitoring, first deemed STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and STAR Math reliable and valid for progress monitoring (http://www.studentprogress.org/chart/docs/print_chart122007.pdf). Each STAR assessment followed a unique path to determine reliability and validity, which is explained below along with lists of the wide range of assessments to which each STAR assessment relates.

Reliability and validity of STAR Early Literacy Enterprise™ Reliability Test reliability is often described as a measure of the consistency of test scores; tests must yield somewhat consistent results in order to be useful. Two kinds of consistency are of concern when evaluating a test’s measurement precision: internal consistency and the consistency of the scores obtained when an assessment is given two or more times.

The internal consistency of STAR Early Literacy Enterprise assessments has been calculated using a method referred to as generic reliability, which uses the conditional measurement error of individual students’ tests to estimate what percentage of the variation in STAR test scores is attributable to the attribute the test is intended to measure.

Consistency of scores across multiple administrations of the assessment to the same students is measured by retest reliability, which is the coefficient of correlation between pairs of test scores earned by the same students on different occasions.

STAR Assessments are highly rated for reliability and validity by key federal groups, such as the National Center on Intensive Intervention, the National Center on Response to Intervention, and the National Center on Student Progress Monitoring.

20

The generic estimates of internal consistency reliability were calculated from analyses of the test scores and their estimated conditional measurement error in a balanced random sample of 10,000 students in each grade, pre-K through 3, who took STAR Early Literacy Enterprise in fall 2012. Another random sample of students who took SEL Enterprise two or more times within a 2-week period across the same school year was analyzed in to order to calculate retest reliability. Table 5 displays both the internal consistency and the retest reliability estimates, by grade and for the five grades combined. The combined-grades reliability coefficients are 0.85 for internal consistency, and 0.79 for consistency on retest.

STAR Reading Enterprise™ Assessment STAR Reading Enterprise is a challenging, interactive, and brief (about 15 minutes) assessment, consisting of 34 questions per test, that evaluates a breadth of reading skills appropriate for grades K–12.2 The assessment’s repeatability and flexibility in administration provide specific advantages for everyone responsible for the education of students:

- Teachers use results from STAR Reading Enterprise to facilitate individualized instruction and identify students who most need remediation or enrichment.
- Principals access assessment information through browser-based management and regular, accurate reports

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

on performance at the individual, class, building, and district level. • Administrators and assessment specialists apply reliable and timely information on reading growth at each school and districtwide, which serves as a valid basis for comparing data across schools, grades, and special student populations.

This item measures: Sound-Symbol Correspondence: Consonants

This item measures: Composing and Decomposing

Early Literacy Item Early Numeracy Item

2 Although STAR Reading Enterprise is normed for grades 1–12, kindergarten students may take the assessment with teacher discretion. Students with a 100-sight-word vocabulary, or who have reached the Probable Reader stage of literacy development in STAR Early Literacy Enterprise, are typically ready to take the assessment.

4

STAR Reading Enterprise is a standards-based test that measures student performance in key reading skills, providing valuable information regarding the acquisition of reading ability along a continuum of literary expectations. Table 3 breaks down the STAR Reading Enterprise item bank by overall size, number and types of items administered per testing event, and average administration time.

Action Steps to Implement

This focus will include the following: 1. Diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment in ELA. 2. Scheduling Intensive ELA for students to work in small groups on targeted areas (differentiation). 3. Collaborative planning ELA teachers to work specifically on designing lesson around data from Diagnostic and progress monitoring platform K12. 4. Focus student and parent communication on data and progress with strategies for home practice. 5. Utilize Instructional Coach to breakdown data points into small increments for teachers to concentrate. 6. Create time for students to practice. 7. For elementary, use Reading Horizons specifically to address building basic reading skills.

Person Responsible Anthony Coppola (anthony.coppola@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Mathematics is an area of focus as students lack the prerequisite skills needed to be successful on higher order thinking associated with Algebra and beyond. All (100%) students assessed on algebra scored at level one. There are a number of reasons why a child may be having problems with math at school, from low motivation caused by math anxiety, to a poor understanding of how to apply and perform mathematical operations. But sometimes the root cause of under-performance is something different, like a learning difference or a motor skills difficulty.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The most commonly associated condition is dyscalculia, in which individuals struggle with performing basic calculations and have trouble manipulating numbers in the same way as their peers.

However, students with dyslexia may also have a hard time with math at school due to difficulty reading numbers and following word problems. They might reorder digits when doing work out on paper, or solve problems correctly but record their answers in the wrong way.

Kids with ADD/ADHD can rush ahead and skip a step or struggle to focus and be unable to check their work once they've finished a problem.

Students with dysgraphia and dyspraxia, who have a hard time writing by hand, might become so distracted by number formation that they make careless errors or get the steps in an equation in the wrong order.

Lastly, children with visual processing disorders might lack the visual-spatial processing skills they need to align numbers, read graphs, and perform basic geometric operations.

STAR Math Enterprise provides a reliable and valid method for measuring progress towards achievable goals in mathematics. Teachers (and administrators) can use the assessment data for instructional planning, growth measurement, and program evaluation. At an individual student level, STAR can be used for a variety of purposes, including screening, formative assessment, progress monitoring, calculating growth, and outcomes assessment. By using the assessment on a regular basis, such as quarterly or monthly, teachers can monitor progress and make appropriate adjustments to instruction. For student learning, our SMART goal for school year 2021 in math:

By June 2021, all students will demonstrate growth in mathematics by increasing their score on the STAR Math assessment in the following manner:

Measurable Outcome:

Subgroup (A) Students who demonstrated they are at/above benchmark as indicated on the STAR Math assessment in the fall will increase their percentile rank to at least 50 percentile or improve on their personal percentile rank (whichever is greater) in the spring.

Subgroup (B): Students who scored in the "on watch" category will grow by at least one level towards meeting the standard to the "at/above benchmark category (above 40 percentile rank).

Subgroup (C) Students who scored in the "intervention" category on STAR in the fall will grow by at least one level towards meeting the standard to the "on watch" category (between 26-39 percentile rank).

Subgroup (D) Students who scored in the "urgent intervention" category (below 10 percentile rank) on STAR in the fall will grow by at least one level towards meeting the standard to the intervention category (between 11-24 percentile rank).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Coppola (anthony.coppola@stlucieschools.org)

There are many strategies teachers can use to increase student academic success with math:

1. Make math relevant.

Motivate learners by showing them real world situations that involve math use outside of school classrooms. Explain how math works, reassure learners that it's not all about arithmetic, and get them excited about giving it a go and feeling comfortable trying out different approaches to problem solving, even if it means they don't always get the right answer.

Evidence-based Strategy:

2. Teach in a multi-sensory way.

The teacher provides verbal explanations, shows work on the board, and if possible, uses tactile props that students can touch and move around. Multi-sensory input can aid learning by making it easier for students to engage with a lesson and can also reinforce material in memory. This is especially important for facilitating understanding in a subject that can be quite abstract.

3. Teach math vocabulary. 4. Give students more time. The need for processing time in math can vary between students but children with learning difficulties often benefit from having more time to understand a concept and see how it works. It also helps to break work down into small steps and give each learner the time they need to process the line they are on before moving to the next one. Extending time limits can help with reducing math anxiety.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Diagnosis of math deficiencies for all students across all grade levels will be the first step in the process of planning for individual student needs. The Renaissance STAR math assessment tool will provide both the diagnostic data as well as data for progress monitoring throughout the year. STAR also provides specific strategies and resources for teachers to use during core math instruction as well as add time for math processing in Intensive Math classes. STAR Math Enterprise is a challenging, interactive, and brief (about 20 minutes) assessment, consisting of 34 items per test, that evaluates students' mathematical abilities in grades K–12.3 Like STAR Reading Enterprise, its repeatability and flexibility in administration provide specific advantages for educators:

- Teachers use results from STAR Math Enterprise to facilitate individualized instruction and identify students who most need remediation or enrichment.
- Principals access assessment information through browser-based management and regular, accurate reports on performance at the individual, class, building, and district level.
- Administrators and assessment specialists apply reliable and timely information on mathematical growth at each school and districtwide, which serves as a valid basis for comparing data across schools, grades, and special student populations.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The following subgroups were identified as not meeting the 41% Federal Index: SWD, FRL, Black, Hispanic White.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the following subgroups will increase their achievement in ELA and mathematics to meet or exceed the 41% Federal Index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Harden (ellen.harden@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Monitor all subgroups up to weekly using STAR 360 ELA and Math. Increase academic time on task in the areas of ELA and Math by providing Tier 2, 3 intervention groups to increase skills in identified areas of need. Monitor student data on Unit assessments and district progress monitoring tool and review with content teachers so that they may include individual strategies for students within their lesson design. Continue to provide SEL in all Tiers 1,2,3 as needed. Provide both a virtual and live after school program for individualized tutoring and support Mondays-Thursdays 4-6 p.m.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With more individualized support for students academically and through SEL with targeted, specific skills, students in all subgroups will increase skills needed for all FSA/EOC assessments leading to graduation/promotion on time.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Retention

Retention can increase the likelihood that a student will drop out of school. Students who drop out are five times more likely to have been retained than those who graduate (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006). Using data from Chicago, Jacob and Lefgren (2007) concluded that students retained in 8th grade were more likely to drop out than their peers. Retention usually duplicates an entire year of schooling. Other options—such as summer school, before-school and after-school programs, or extra help during the school day—could provide equivalent extra time in more instructionally effective ways. Without early diagnosis and targeted intervention, struggling students are unlikely to catch up whether they are promoted or retained.

Focus:

- 1. Utilize Graduation Coach to determine what students need in order to be promoted (credits, assessments, blending, GLO)**
- 2. Create opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of missed content versus take entire course over (use assessment data, course recovery, after school, added course during school day, intensive remediation)**
- 3. Create goals and deadlines for students - monitor progress weekly.**
- 4. Determine best learning style for struggling students - live instruction, computer assisted, blended, provide more time, provide more support (ESE, ELL, 504) more hands-on. Match style to delivery of content.**

SEL

- 1. Use Mental Health, DATA, and guidance counselors for students with at risk behaviors.**
- 2. Train teachers on specific programs to support SEL (Sanford Harmony, Lion's Quest, High School Connect).**
- 3. Create SEL school-wide model.**
- 4. Monitor 30:30 plan within designated - planned student schedule.**
- 5. For elementary - concentrate on Zones of Regulation.**
- 6. For all - include circles.**
- 7. For staff - create opportunities for checks throughout the day, planned circles during CLP, train house leaders to monitor team SEL needs and report needs to administration team.**

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.

A positive school culture is made up of the following components:

1. Relationships - we have to work together to create and maintain an atmosphere of trust and support - a place where people want to be. A school culture exists because of people - all people (aides, site maintenance, food service, secretary, clerk, teachers, administration, students, parents, community) - all. Relationship building is one of the highest yield strategies for student success.
2. Shared Vision - being CONSISTENT. Being treated in the same manner as everyone else. Single school culture as to rules, expectations, routines. PBIS is a large part of what we do, how we do, why we do. We must show stakeholders what our model looks like Respect, Responsible, Safe and Engaged
3. Set the tone - role model - walk the walk. Modeling is key to understanding - lead by example. Show staff, students, parents how to be kind and caring and valued.
4. Praise and celebrate - both for students and staff. All need to feel appreciated and valued.

A plan for laying out above as a single school culture model for students, parents and staff has been made through Open house and intake presentation, pre-school planning sessions, students within first days of attendance and on-going throughout the year.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00