Allapattah Flats K 8

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Allapattah Flats K 8

12051 NW COPPER CREEK DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34987

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/apf

Demographics

Principal: Ana Rodriguez Oronoz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2020-21 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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	
* 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 10/12/2021.

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

Allapattah Flats K 8

12051 NW COPPER CREEK DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34987

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/apf

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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 Allapattah Flats is to develop partnerships that maximize resources to create opportunities for learning beyond the classroom. We will provide quality instruction to facilitate academic, emotional, and social growth. We will seek to be innovators, embrace change, and continually evolve in order to guide students in recognizing their personal struggles and interests, and utilize them as pathways to a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Allapattah Flats vision is to become a center of learning that extends beyond the schoolhouse doors, where students are able to articulate future goals and actively work towards those goals as independent learners.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rodriguez, Ana	Principal	Analyze Student Performance Data and Identify Areas of Growth Monitor Strategic Practice of Interventions Lead Collaborative Learning and Planing Maximize Time on Instructional Tasks, Learning Opportunities, and Resources Implement District Curriculum and Learning Programs Recognize Achievement and Growth
Lewis, Margaret	Assistant Principal	Lead Professional Learning and Planning Analyze Progress, Instructional Needs, and Growth Deliver Professional Development and Support Teachers Evaluate Instructional Practices
Allen, Jud	Assistant Principal	Lead Professional Learning and Planning Analyze Progress, Instructional Needs, and Growth Deliver Professional Development and Support Teachers Evaluate Instructional Practices
Wilson, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	School and District Liaison Deliver Professional Development Support New Teachers Mentor Teachers Facilitate Professional Learning and Planning Model High Yield Strategies in Classrooms Provide Actionable Feedback to Teachers Facilitate Implementation of District Routines for ELA and Math
Wild-Miller, Melissa	Other	Analyze Trend Data and Current Data to Identify MTSS Groups Deliver Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions to Students Monitor Lowest Quartile and Provide Input for Teachers Model Practice of Tier 2 Programs
Carey, Georgia	School Counselor	Monitor Implementation of Social Emotional Learning Monitor High School Requirements Coordinate After School Homework Club based on Power if BI Grading Data Plan Interventions for RtI Behavior and Monitor Growth Design Point Sheets for Students in Check In Check Out Plan and Deliver Interventions for Attendance Collaborate with Project Success, BIC Monitor, Deans, and Sequel Care Counselor
Slater, Melynda	School Counselor	Monitor Implementation of Social Emotional Learning Support Students and Teachers in Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Units Coordinate After School Homework Club based on Power if BI

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Grading Data Plan Interventions for RtI Behavior and Monitor Growth Design Point Sheets for Students in Check In Check Out Plan and Deliver Interventions for Attendance Collaborate with Project Success, BIC Monitor, Deans, and Sequel Care Counselor
Nelson, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Acceleration Teacher SAC Member After School Tutoring Coordinator Math Liaison

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/28/2021, Ana Rodriguez Oronoz

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.*

5

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,076

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	80	108	89	109	128	112	136	155	174	0	0	0	0	1091
Attendance below 90 percent	16	31	30	27	25	27	31	45	38	0	0	0	0	270
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	6	8	14	13	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	33	19	24	38	44	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	30	31	22	39	55	0	0	0	0	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	1	2	2	4	23	28	30	0	0	0	0	94

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	1	2	1	21	26	24	28	51	54	0	0	0	0	208

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	

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

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	60%	61%	47%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	58%	59%	52%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	50%	54%	51%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				55%	58%	62%	52%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				57%	56%	59%	52%	57%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	46%	52%	41%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				55%	58%	56%	38%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	74%	78%	76%	74%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	58%	50%	8%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	48%	9%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2021					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	52%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	60%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2021					
	2019	54%	47%	7%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
07	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	54%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	36%	34%	2%	46%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	46%	11%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	48%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	72%	67%	5%	71%	1%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	51%	45%	61%	35%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for K-8 was iReady Diagnostics. Science and Civics progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38	19	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	16	29
	Students With Disabilities	21	0	7
	English Language Learners	43	7	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	12	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	10	31
	Students With Disabilities	14	0	20
	English Language Learners	50	7	36

Grade 2			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**

	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	80	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	72	74
	Students With Disabilities	30	61	55
	English Language Learners	56	89	89
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	76	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	65	78
	Students With Disabilities	44	61	62
	English Language Learners	44	56	78

Grade 3			

	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	76	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	67	79
	Students With Disabilities	19	41	70
	English Language Learners	55	67	83
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	80	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	75	84
	Students With Disabilities	33	48	55
	English Language Learners	55	75	83

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	82	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	77	75
	Students With Disabilities	35	52	52
	English Language Learners	44	63	60
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	80	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	75	76
	Students With Disabilities	38	50	50
	English Language Learners	56	56	57

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	67	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	60	69
	Students With Disabilities	29	25	11
	English Language Learners	33	33	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	75	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	72	80
	Students With Disabilities	16	30	44
	English Language Learners	100	33	100
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	63	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	50	46
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	6
	English Language Learners	33	67	33

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	56	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	45	53
	Students With Disabilities	18	27	36
	English Language Learners	14	29	29
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	69	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	61	61
	Students With Disabilities	18	49	45
	English Language Learners	57	57	71

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	42	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	40	37
	Students With Disabilities	27	26	19
	English Language Learners	9	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	54	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	51	42
	Students With Disabilities	32	39	25
	English Language Learners	27	14	8
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	27	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	22	35
	Students With Disabilities	24	0	13
	English Language Learners	27	7	6

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	53	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	48	33
	Students With Disabilities	12	20	27
	English Language Learners	0	29	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	24	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	20	10
	Students With Disabilities	6	18	17
	English Language Learners	0	20	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	47	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	46	37
	Students With Disabilities	18	16	21
	English Language Learners	0	33	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	37	36	19	31	25	25	44			
ELL	35	51	47	43	34	27	36	38			
BLK	39	50	36	37	33	22	38	55	61		
HSP	54	54	47	53	45	28	56	61	60		
MUL	62	56		65	38		55				
WHT	60	56	21	60	53	60	62	82	68		
FRL	45	53	43	46	38	26	47	61	61		
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	20	37	39	22	39	33	22	61			
ELL	35	56	54	38	48	39	50	40			
BLK	46	55	52	50	58	49	44	69	100		

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	49	54	42	52	56	57	56	68	95		
MUL	58	53		56	53						
WHT	58	60	44	62	56	34	61	79	91		
FRL	48	55	48	52	55	45	51	70	93		

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	15	41	49	24	38	36	13	60			
ELL	32	56	70	33	42	35	25				
BLK	39	50	59	43	52	41	24	81	100		
HSP	51	51	54	55	43	33	42	74	50		
MUL	38	38		52	67						
WHT	51	56	37	57	58	44	48	72	83		
FRL	44	50	50	50	52	43	36	75	83		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	92%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students' writing scores demonstrate success of writing plan and initiatives. Math performance dropped significantly across grade levels. Overall reading proficiency was maintained. Students in the lowest quartile are not making adequate progress in reading or math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students with disabilities and students in the lowest quartile have not made adequate progress. Acceleration proficiency and Civics performance decreased.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors were the constant changing of schedules for students in and out of My School Virtual and limited opportunities to organize students for processing tasks. Planning will focus on addressing differentiated needs and strategic interventions for students in the lowest quartile and SWD.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Considering the conditions for learning impacted by the pandemic, reading performance and writing did not decrease as much as math performance. We were able to maintain overall proficiency levels and writing progress. Although Civics proficiency decreased, 44% of Level 1 and 2 readers in 7th grade passed the Civics exam.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In the past few years, teams have focused on planning standards based instruction and making decisions about interventions based on progress monitoring data. We have also focused on the effective implementation of literacy routines and differentiated instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will conduct walk through observations to provide actionable feedback. Team leaders will participate in CLP facilitator PD. We've added another session of planning for all teams to the master schedule. We will continue to learn and practice processing strategies from the SLPS Teacher Framework.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

SLPS has created modules CLP procedures, effective practices for planning, and analyzing student work. We will provide support through Team Leader meetings. Becky Wilson will deliver PD on goal setting, aggressive monitoring, specific processing strategies, and organizing students to interact with content.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The Literacy team will meet monthly to discuss observations and provide support as needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The English Language Arts block in middle school consists of an extended block of 90 minutes. Teachers plan for reading, language, and writing lessons. Teachers must also plan interventions for students in differentiated groups. This has been a challenging task, due to the different levels of proficiency and diverse needs of students when they enter middle school. iReady is one of our resources but not one that students find engaging. We find that teachers hold on to whole group instruction and wait too long to transitions to a total release of independent work, paired with feedback and aggressive monitoring. We have everything we need for content planning. We need to add high effect strategies to every day lessons and build a timeline for release of independent work.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students will increase proficiency by 10% points. Students in the lowest quartile will increase proficiency by 5% points. ESE students will increase proficiency by 5% points.
Monitoring:	Admin team will conduct walk though visits to monitor implementation of literacy routines and fidelity of programs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Margaret Lewis (margaret.lewis@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning and Learning, Marzano high yield strategies, aggressive monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have made improvement in planning collaboratively, using data to drive decisions, and implementing small group instruction. Now, we have to be more explicit and deliberate in our practice to reach goals for each subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze baseline data.
2. Identify standards of focus and targeted groups.
3. Design action plan with follow up stopping points and discussions, aggressive monitoring practices, differentiation through iReady, teacher/student conferencing.
4. Job embedded PD: teachers observing teachers, coaches modeling best practices, actionable feedback.

Person Responsible Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of teacher survey results, Panorama Student Survey data, student discipline data, and staff and student attendance data indicate a need to address the social emotional learning needs of our school.
Measurable Outcome:	1. The number of discipline referrals will decrease by 15% or more. 2. The number of students with attendance below 90 percent will be reduced by 10% 3. The number of students exhibiting 2 or more early warning indicators will decrease by 10%. 4. Teacher perception of student behavioral concerns as measured by the district teacher climate survey will decrease by 15%. 5. Student perception of sense of belonging and safety will increase by 35% as measured by the Panorama student survey.
Monitoring:	Fidelity Checks with Feedback District Climate Survey and Panorama Student Survey
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony/Lions Quest/School-Connect will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walk through tools. The SEL committee will work in collaboration with PBIS, guidance, and dean.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students are lacking basic social/emotional life skills needed for success in school, at home, and in the community. 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

8/21 - Staff SEL PD
All students in traditional and virtual learning will participate in community circles.
Teachers will set SEL grade group goals to explicitly plan team building.
Teachers will monitor progress through student surveys throughout the year.
In addition, administrative team will plan SEL activities for staff.

Person Responsible	Margaret Lewis (margaret.lewis@stlucieschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD have not shown adequate progress in previous performance measures compared to their non disabled peers.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD will increase performance by 15 percentage points.
Monitoring:	Data chats after each unit assessment. Observation of MTSS strategies and implementation. Progress monitoring of Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement Best Practice for Inclusive Education. Instructional and non instructional staff will be well versed in co teaching model and strategies to meet students' IEP goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom teachers and support facilitators will plan collaboratively to design instruction and practice that will increase learning gains for SWD. A co teaching model with a side of differentiated groups and aggressive monitoring will ensure all students' needs are met.

Action Steps to Implement

Build a schedule with common planning for classroom teacher and support facilitator. Include ESE staff in PD tasks and sessions. Create an action plan that includes model classrooms and observations, specific objectives and dates to reflect on practices, data analysis to evaluate progress.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	One or more grades are below 50% for proficiency in ELA: 3rd 49% 4th 48%
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2022, 51% of students in grades 3rd and 4th will show proficiency in ELA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, and tiered intervention progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K - 5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes - Use Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. - Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. - Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group – using monitoring schools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments).

Person Responsible	Ana Rodriguez (ana.rodriguez-oronoz@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention.

Person Responsible	Melissa Wild-Miller (melissa.wild@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback

Person Responsible	Rebecca Wilson (rebecca.wilson@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

APF reported 1.6 incidents per 100 students. Violent incidents rank high. Suspensions have decreased in the past years.

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.

According to the 20-21 Climate Survey, a small percentage of teachers feel that they are not recognized for their accomplishments. In addition, less than 25% of teachers feel that they are not able to voice concerns to admin, specifically discipline and grading concerns. We developed focus groups to address each indicator. Teachers came up with ideas like adding a "suggestion box" to the mail room and using admin notes to provide Kudos during walk through visits. We will deliver PD regarding discipline practices and RtI Behavior processes.
We plan quarterly luncheons for staff appreciation and monthly treats through our PBIS Committee and PTO.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administration - Monitor school programs. Analyze climate survey results and seek faculty input.
Coaches - Support instructional initiatives and teaching practices.
Deans - Monitor organizational procedures to promote a Single School Culture.
Guidance Counselors - Coordinate and monitor implementation of MTSS and SEL.
Team Leaders - Liaisons for students and grade level teams.
PTO - Support school wide initiatives and student climate.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00