

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Samuel S. Gaines Academy Of Emerging Technologies



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>

# Samuel S. Gaines Academy Of Emerging Technologies

2250 S JENKINS RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

<http://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/sga/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Keith Davis**

Start Date for this Principal: 10/16/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (38%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>

## Samuel S. Gaines Academy Of Emerging Technologies

2250 S JENKINS RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

<http://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/sga/>

### 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	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.

Samuel S. Gaines of Emerging Technologies is a STEM Magnet. We will provide the instructional building blocks to develop lifelong learners and 21st century global citizens. Students will become critical thinking problem solvers who work collaboratively to improve the world around them. An engaging learning environment will promote student leaders who are capable of making evidence based decisions and develop multiple solutions for complex real world situations.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the use of cutting-edge technology and an integrated, multidisciplinary approach to teaching and learning, Samuel S. Gaines Academy of Emerging Technologies will provide a rigorous and innovative academic program, while creating the blueprint for STEM education within St. Lucie Public Schools

### 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
Davis, Keith	Principal	Direct and manage instructional program and supervise operations and personnel at school base. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all school based activities
Rodriguez, Amy	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and school based level operations. Coordinate assigned student activities. Responsible Middle School ELA, Social Studies, and Elementary grades 1,4
Davino, John	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and school based level operations. Coordinate assigned student activities. Responsible Middle School Math, Science, and Elementary grades K,2,5
Powers, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Responsible Science, Math, and STEM advocates
Howard, Keturah	Reading Coach	Middle School ELA/Reading Coach

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 10/16/2017, Keith Davis

**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.*

7

**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.*

22

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

32

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

829

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

8

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

6

**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	43	47	72	77	110	87	108	120	108	0	0	0	0	772	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	21	23	44	29	32	34	37	0	0	0	0	234	
One or more suspensions	3	0	3	12	15	10	8	10	7	0	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4	0	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	45	29	18	33	20	0	0	0	0	178	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	52	48	30	36	14	0	0	0	0	217	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	2	0	51	54	22	0	0	0	0	134	

**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	3	0	2	30	49	36	42	49	43	0	0	0	0	254	

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/13/2021

**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	0	
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	
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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## 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				36%	60%	61%	25%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	58%	59%	50%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	50%	54%	53%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				45%	58%	62%	35%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				58%	56%	59%	57%	57%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	46%	52%	59%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				37%	58%	56%	30%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				55%	74%	78%	48%	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	33%	50%	-17%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	27%	51%	-24%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	48%	-18%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
06	2021					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
07	2021					
	2019	31%	49%	-18%	52%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	47%	-20%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
06	2021					
	2019	55%	47%	8%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
07	2021					
	2019	43%	50%	-7%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	34%	8%	46%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	32%	46%	-14%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	38%	48%	-10%	48%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	55%	67%	-12%	71%	-16%
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	95%	51%	44%	61%	34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

### 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 monitor data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	9	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	8	27
	Students With Disabilities	14	0	12
	English Language Learners	8	8	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	16	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	17	42
	Students With Disabilities	14	13	19
	English Language Learners	0	8	33
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	14	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	11	22
	Students With Disabilities	20	7	15
	English Language Learners	0	9	5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	11	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	7	18
	Students With Disabilities	8	0	0
	English Language Learners	14	9	9

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40	52	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	52	57
	Students With Disabilities	11	21	21
	English Language Learners	30	44	48
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45	65	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	68	80
	Students With Disabilities	28	39	58
	English Language Learners	30	48	75
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45	54	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	55	59
	Students With Disabilities	17	8	4
	English Language Learners	23	45	58
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	60	91
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	58	91
	Students With Disabilities	29	24	89
	English Language Learners	36	45	75

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	37	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	39	50
	Students With Disabilities	6	12	6
	English Language Learners	32	32	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	55	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	58	66
	Students With Disabilities	18	18	18
	English Language Learners	61	54	70
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42	39	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	40	49
	Students With Disabilities	25	9	18
	English Language Learners	30	21	50
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	45	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	46	56
	Students With Disabilities	7	14	14
	English Language Learners	19	21	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51	60	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	54	60
	Students With Disabilities	7	14	14
	English Language Learners	35	41	59

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	49	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	47	49
	Students With Disabilities	5	18	10
	English Language Learners	18	0	24
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	49	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	46	45
	Students With Disabilities	10	14	14
	English Language Learners	31	19	18
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	26	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	24	21
	Students With Disabilities	13	7	7
	English Language Learners	6	0	0



Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	59	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	62	61
	Students With Disabilities	7	13	20
	English Language Learners	0	8	8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	27	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	27	34
	Students With Disabilities	50	7	14
	English Language Learners	29	14	14
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	42	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	39	37
	Students With Disabilities	11	10	10
	English Language Learners	17	0	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	26	42	42	28	54	48	26	37			
ELL	34	53	60	36	38	38	28	64	67		
BLK	36	51	51	32	41	43	33	62	90		
HSP	44	56	56	46	47	39	42	71	81		
MUL	44	57		50	64						
WHT	54	54	36	59	68	86	63	58	91		
FRL	41	54	54	40	46	46	41	64	83		
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	15	41	33	24	53	48	21	27			
ELL	27	51	48	40	52	50	27	37			
BLK	29	50	48	30	56	52	21	45	92		

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	39	56	53	53	59	55	43	63	96		
MUL	36	40		50	55						
WHT	41	72	50	57	65		44	67			
FRL	34	55	54	41	58	55	32	52	92		
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	7	44	47	7	33	38	4	11			
ELL	18	54	53	34	58	61	10	27			
BLK	17	43	56	23	49	54	17	40	50		
HSP	31	55	51	42	61	65	34	49	81		
MUL	24	40		48	73						
WHT	29	57		38	66	55	47	54			
FRL	24	48	51	35	57	59	30	48	73		

### 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	531
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	47
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	54
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	54
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	63
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	52
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?

ELA Achievement Level

Scores are distant behind the district Achievement Levels. Students scores are due to lack of comprehension and fluency

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

Math Bottom 25% saw a decline. Students struggle with reading which impacts math word problems. Students struggle with math facts and working with graph paper as a tool.

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

School based interventionist to focus on small group using math facts and real world problem solving skills.

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

Civics and Science showed improvement compared to previous years cohorts

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

Focus on vocabulary using real world solutions. Camps supporting content areas during summer and prior to testing

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

Students will need support in ELA testing strategies. Such as context clues and access to content earlier.

#### 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.

District training will continue with Civics and Debate initiatives from the state. Schools will adjust schedules to support Civics and Science content with school and community experts.

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

Small group Instruction

On-going Pd from district for Civics and Debate Initiatives

Continued camps

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	SGAET will focus on ELA and Math. Students with disabilities are not progressing at the same rate as non-disabled peers as identified from unit assessments, iReady diagnostics, Reading Plus, 2018-19 FSA and FSAA scores.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Students with disabilities at SGAET will make at least 5% growth as evidenced by iReady Diagnostic, Unique Learning System Progress Monitoring Tool, FSA and FSAA.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Teachers will use CLP to discuss Unique and Iready data. Admin and ESE chairs will attend meetings
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	John Davino (john.davino@stlucieschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students with disabilities will be provided small group remediation for skills not mastered as identified through progress monitoring. Groups will be fluid and flexible depending on the skill
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Small group instruction using jigsaw strategies for remediation allows students to be given specific instruction on skills not mastered. Small group instruction and jigsaw strategies are high yield with an effect size of nearly 2 yrs growth

**Action Steps to Implement**

After each unit assessment, monthly iReady progress monitoring and Unique Learning System progress monitoring, Teachers will review student outcomes to determine support needed to be provided and track progression.

**Person Responsible** John Davino (john.davino@stlucieschools.org)

Teachers will drill down the outcomes to specific skills that will be retaught, plan for effective reteaching, and group students accordingly. Students may be in multiple small groups depending on the needs of each student.

**Person Responsible** John Davino (john.davino@stlucieschools.org)

Teachers will use iReady, Cpalms, Journeys, math task cards for remediation/reteaching of skill deficits

**Person Responsible** John Davino (john.davino@stlucieschools.org)

Teachers will use a check for understanding after reteaching/remediating skill to determine skill mastery

**Person Responsible** John Davino (john.davino@stlucieschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Grades 3,4, and 5 are below 50% for proficiency in ELA. 3rd grade 30%, 4th grade 32%, 5th grade 34% scores based on FSA ELA (2020-2021).
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By the end of 2022, 51% students in grades 3,4, and 5 will show proficiency in ELA.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, K-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	- Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan) - 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
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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** Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible** Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible** Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

**According to our 2019 data for combination schools we have 2.3 incidents per 100 students ranking us 246/ out of 313. The state average is 1.6 incidents per 100 students. SGAET is ranked 10/11 in SLPS. This is considered High on this platform. We are a Leader In Me school Based which is based on Covey's Seven Habits. We are also a PBIS and Kids and Hope supported. We have seen a huge reduction of Out of School suspensions(nearly 78%) One of the key components was our Single School Culture. We will continue to closely monitor our habitual repeaters and provide them support through mentoring and strategies with small groups.**

#### **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 our staff survey results  
 We outpaced the District in all areas  
 Work Environment SGAET 83% District 82.1%  
 Leadership SGAET 87.5% District 84.2%  
 Workforce Engagement SGAET 86.9% District 83.6%  
 Stakeholder Input SGAET 82.3% District 81.4%  
 Safety SGAET 92.2% District 91.8%

However, some areas that we need to continue to improve are listed below:

- Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is clean and well-maintained(WE)
- Opportunities are available for parents to express their concerns and propose solutions to improve the school(SI)
- Teachers have influence over evaluating and grading their students(SI)
- If I report unsafe or dangerous behaviors administration will promptly take care of the problem.(S)

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

SGAET has been fortunate to have such a diverse and positive culture.

Our faculty and staff retention has increased to 80%

We have received our surveys from students, parents, and teachers. The results were SGAET is a safe place. It is a learning environment that allow students to be creative, problem solvers.



SGAET has embraced Leader In Me which allow students to transition from extrinsic to intrinsic rewards. Leader In Me is part of our SEL for adults and students, it is based on Covey's Seven Habits. Our students have a minimum of 30 minutes in SEL Circles, with different topics ranging from personal and academic to world impact. Our consultant visits and progress monitor Single School Culture. She is often sharing how she shares our school story. We have several staff members enrolling their children in our school. Which is great measure of culture.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00