Manatee Academy K 8

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Manatee Academy K 8

1450 SW HEATHERWOOD BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

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

Demographics

Principal: Kerri Walukiewicz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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

Manatee Academy K 8

1450 SW HEATHERWOOD BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

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

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 KG-8	Yes	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

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 Manatee Academy is to ensure all students graduate from a safe and caring school, equipped with the knowledge, skills, and desire to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee Academy, in partnership with parents and community, will become a premier center of knowledge that emphasizes organized around students and the work provided to them. Manatee Academy's name will be synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our school's promise is to move from good to great focusing on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for each student, every day. This is the St. Lucie Way!

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
Beauchamp, Lillian	Principal	
Share, Joseph	Assistant Principal	
Sexton, Tari	Assistant Principal	
Montoya, Dawn	School Counselor	Middle School counselor
Benulis, Kara	Dean	Elementary Dean
Biss, Mark	Dean	Middle School Dean
Vandegrift, Samantha	Teacher, ESE	Middle School ESE Specialist
Taylor, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Interventionist
Rosado, Cassie	Teacher, ESE	Elementary ESE Specialist
Jerome, Janet	School Counselor	Elementary Guidance
Navaretta, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	School Assessment Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Kerri Walukiewicz

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.*

6

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.*

24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

97

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,507

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

9

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

11

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	97	106	119	127	143	159	211	238	230	0	0	0	0	1430
Attendance below 90 percent	24	20	28	19	29	33	33	52	39	0	0	0	0	277
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	10	15	26	22	19	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	8	15	34	26	36	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	9	8	66	53	29	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	35	37	58	56	36	0	0	0	0	250
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	41	52	62	51	43	0	0	0	0	271
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	5	8	9	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	0	24	37	49	84	70	55	0	0	0	0	323

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	8
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

Wednesday 8/25/2021

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	93	106	109	127	143	163	215	237	228	0	0	0	0	1421
Attendance below 90 percent	3	20	19	25	24	21	31	58	62	0	0	0	0	263
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	4	5	10	28	36	29	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	31	8	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	37	57	26	0	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	22	60	58	30	0	0	0	0	172

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	2	6	15	44	67	38	0	0	0	0	172

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	93	106	109	127	143	163	215	237	228	0	0	0	0	1421
Attendance below 90 percent	3	20	19	25	24	21	31	58	62	0	0	0	0	263
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	4	5	10	28	36	29	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	31	8	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	37	57	26	0	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	22	60	58	30	0	0	0	0	172

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	2	6	15	44	67	38	0	0	0	0	172

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				61%	60%	61%	56%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	58%	59%	58%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	50%	54%	52%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				60%	58%	62%	62%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				50%	56%	59%	63%	57%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	46%	52%	55%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				47%	58%	56%	56%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				71%	74%	78%	78%	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	66%	50%	16%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	48%	0%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
07	2021					
	2019	58%	49%	9%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

				MATH			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	66%	55%	11%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	47%	3%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2021					
	2019	69%	47%	22%	55%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
07	2021					
	2019	62%	50%	12%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2021					
	2019	27%	34%	-7%	46%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

				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	45%	46%	-1%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	48%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	69%	67%	2%	71%	-2%
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	75%	51%	24%	61%	14%
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 monitoring data was district-created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	97 28%	22%	46%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	59 29%	19%	44%
English Language Arts	Students With Disabilities	19 16%	10%	25%
English Language Arts	English Language Learners	6 0%	9%	29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	96 21%	17%	38%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	58 19%	14%	41%
Mathematics	Students With Disabilities	19 11%	10%	40%
Mathematics	English Language Learners	6 17%	0%	14%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	110 78%	0%	90%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	64 75%	83%	88%
English Language Arts	Students With Disabilities	19 42%	79%	84%
English Language Arts	English Language Learners	3 33%	74%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	110 73%	85%	95%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	64 70%	79%	96%
Mathematics	Students With Disabilities	19 68%	79%	100%
Mathematics	English Language Learners	3 33%	33%	67%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	118 75%	33%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73 64%	85%	80%
	Students With Disabilities	19 42%	81%	61%
	English Language Learners	10 30%	56%	55%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	118 75%	85%	94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73 70%	81%	93%
	Students With Disabilities	19 37%	68%	82%
	English Language Learners	10 60%	55%	82%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	127 72%	64%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	85 72%	74%	79%
	Students With Disabilities	28 32%	70%	53%
	English Language Learners	17 47%	52%	56%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	123 66%	73%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	82 61%	69%	79%
	Students With Disabilities	27 44%	45%	61%
	English Language Learners	16 50%	47%	72%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	155 66%	53%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	89 64%	76%	78%
	Students With Disabilities	22 41%	74%	32%
	English Language Learners	11 9%	43%	59%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	157 74%	81%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	89 73%	80%	78%
	Students With Disabilities	22 41%	46%	32%
	English Language Learners	11 46%	50%	59%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	150 51%	54%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83 46%	44%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	20 25%	29%	24%
	English Language Learners	10 0%	0%	8%

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	189 43%	44%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	127 44%	49%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	51 16%	49%	16%
	English Language Learners	13 23%	10%	30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	195 60%	64%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	132 60%	64%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	52 17%	21%	33%
	English Language Learners	13 23%	39%	39%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	183 67%	17%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	96 57%	60%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	23 26%	57%	50%
	English Language Learners	10 20%	24%	36%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	183 67%	67%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	95 60%	43%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	23 26%	50%	44%
	English Language Learners	9 44%	58%	64%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	223 47%	32%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	117 44%	29%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	29 21%	16%	13%
	English Language Learners	15 0%	0%	7%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	207 61%	39%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	120 57%	56%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	34 27%	50%	47%
	English Language Learners	6 0%	28%	13%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	202 61%	54%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	120 61%	25%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	36 28%	29%	48%
	English Language Learners	5 20%	20%	20%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	203 36%	53%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	118 33%	39%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	24 13%	23%	15%
	English Language Learners	5 20%	0%	13%

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	19	33	32	24	43	44	24	48			
ELL	30	51	57	33	60	59	25	59			
ASN	70	75		58	50						
BLK	42	45	36	44	46	46	39	62	72		
HSP	51	57	41	53	59	56	49	64	80		
MUL	70	50		60	50		61				
WHT	57	57	48	59	58	51	56	81	77		
FRL	49	51	41	49	52	50	43	68	71		
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	29	41	33	27	40	27	20	43			
ELL	39	63	54	39	48	36	30	50			

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
ASN	79	78		74	61						
BLK	53	59	48	48	42	34	27	68	76		
HSP	62	61	48	63	52	40	45	71	85		
MUL	76	71		74	58		75				
WHT	63	59	45	65	53	38	58	71	78		
FRL	56	59	44	55	49	38	40	63	75		
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	22	46	41	24	57	52	27	59			
ELL	28	46	52	38	47	50	18				
ASN	75	64		81	57						
BLK	48	55	46	55	66	60	51	74	67		
HSP	58	62	55	59	60	55	51	74	67		
MUL	66	64		78	68		85				
WHT	59	56	55	68	63	49	63	81	78		
FRL	51	57	51	56	61	55	54	74	77		

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	58
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	59
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	58
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	60
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	54
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?

Math Lowest 25% was the lowest performing group. The pacing calendar can present a challenge to meet the needs of our students who struggle. The mastery of content is not always attained before moving forward. The rigor and complexity of the questions assessed were too high and the text resources not aligned however the teacher are making adaptations to meet the needs of the learners.

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

Math Lowest 25% showed the greatest decline. This trend is seen across the district and state due to issues above as well as the barrier with virtual learning.

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

Math Lowest 25% displayed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The curriculum department is examining some possible reasons why this decline was exhibited across our schools and working with school math team leaders to narrow this gap. Another factor that may have contributed to this decline could be a lack of time spent to thoroughly explore and master the standards rather than trying to cover so many at a surface level.

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

ELA Achievement showed the most improvement. This was an area of focus on previous SIP goals.

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

This was accomplished through targeted professional growth that focused on high-needs standards, the chunking of essays in instruction, modeled lessons by the instructional coach as well as data chats with instructional leaders on campus. The differentiated instruction was a large focus after diagnostic testing including focused collaborative planning. There was a school wide emphasis on reading instruction not only at the Tier 1 level but also at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 level. The ELA teachers had a day each quarter to hold data chants with their students to discuss in detail their progress as well as feedback on how to improve their writing scores.

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

In the classrooms, the incorporation of more specific writing conferences with students will allow them to grow and increase achievement. Additionally,collaborative planning within the grade level as well

as vertical alignment with surrounding grades will allow everyone to know where students are coming from and where they are going.

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.

The district professional development and curriculum departments support our teachers with collaborative planning support as well as standards analysis. These trainings are attended by administration and in turn, admin will provide continuous feedback including data chats.

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

The need to build capacity through collaborative planning will be key in their growth. Admin will follow up with teachers based upon the district professional development that was provided.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Learning Gains in Lowest 25% in Math. This performance area decreased significantly . We need to identify and target students to provide them with intense, remedial instruction to supplement their current curriculum and work to close the achievement gap, ultimately moving them towards proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to increase this performance area to at least 45%. We want to see an overall increase in this performance area in all of our subgroups.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored through several means of data collection including IReady Diagnostic growth and district unit assessments. The data chats after each of the assessments will help to focus our targeted strategic instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	RtI (Walk to Intervention) groups for the lowest 25% will be created based upon our data. Double blocks of math in grades 6-8 will replace critical thinking. Students will receive daily targeted instruction to fine-tune deficits and will be closely monitored through data collection and analysis of the data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction meets the needs of all students to help ensure growth/mastery. A variety of resources will be utilized to help monitor such as IReady and district-created unit assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify the lowest 25% in each grade level.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Ensure all identified students are in a targeted RtI group (K-5)/double block of math (6-8)

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Provide time for Diagnostic assessment/progress monitoring assessments (ongoing)

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions by teachers & leadership team through data analysis.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Provide additional support, resources, and interventions as needed

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Provide math tutoring program after school beginning in January for targeted students.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of need deals with our Students With Disabilities learning gains falling below the threshold of 41%. We can identify and target these students in targeted grade levels to provide more intense, remedial instruction to supplement their current curriculum in order to narrow the gap.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to increase the overall performance of our SWD subgroup to 43%. We would like to show increases in all areas including proficiency, learning gains, and bottom quartile learning gains.
Monitoring:	The data collected by the IReady Diagnostic as well as the district-created unit assessments will be key in making sure that we monitor the achievement by this subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Vandegrift (samantha.vandegrift@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboration between support facilitation and gen ed teachers will be key in increasing proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Analyzing individual students data based upon the standards will be key to supporting our SWD group and their deficiencies. Our RtI will be a place to implement small-group interventions to help focus in on the key standards that increase achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify all SWD in the school.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Assign each student to an ESE teacher (caseload)

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

ESE teachers will collaborate with gen ed teachers with whom they support.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Analyze student data using Performance Matters.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Provide additional support, resources, and interventions as needed.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Pull SWD into small groups based on the standards not achieved on unit assessments.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of science for 5th and 8th grade shows as an area for improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to increase proficiency in Science by 10%.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored by district-created unit assessments, including data chats after each one.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Cross-curricular planning among 5th and 8th grade teachers to infuse more STEM lessons into their lesson planning to better align science content-rich concepts into math, reading and ELA. This will help to immerse science into more than just the allotted time. Focus on the vertical alignment of 4th/5th and 6th-8th science to ensure student are being equipped with content-mastery prior to the high-stakes testing in 5th and 8th grades.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Science is a content-based reading test. If the content is delivered, taught, explored, and reviewed in multiple settings, the likelihood that they will retain it increases and content-mastery is accomplished. These are 2 grade levels where we can better integrate the units of curriculum across other content areas. We want to see an overall increase in this performance area in all of our subgroups as well.

Action Steps to Implement

Cross-curricular planning among 5th and 8th grade teams to infuse STEM/science units & concepts

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

ELA and Reading to choose from Science topics with more frequency to better support the content.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Vertical alignment with the lower grades to discuss the standards students are deficient in based upon unit assessment data.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA. 4th grade, 47%
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2022, 51% students in grade 4 will show proficiency in ELA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, as well as tiered intervention progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Taylor (amy.taylor@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- 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
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	Lillian Beauchamp (lillian.beauchamp@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible	Amy Taylor (amy.taylor@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible	Tari Sexton (tari.sexton@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.

One of our primary areas of concern are the suspension rate (11/100 students) which is tied directly to our secondary concern of fighting/physical attack (1.8/100 students). For the upcoming year we will be incorporating Ripple Effects for Kids which is an evidence-based multi-tiered, digital system of personalized interventions and behavioral supports. This support, along with the community approach to determining and providing appropriate interventions for students who show struggle will help to reduce our rates. We will monitor behavior/discipline data through our PBIS committee and continue to look at our Tier 1 systems to help decrease these rates. The continued implementation of PBIS as well as SEL will support this. One area in SEL that will align with these goals and is a focus for this year is the survey category of "Sense of Belonging." Our goal is to increase our students' sense of belonging to be greater than or equal to 70%.

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.

We strive to have a welcoming school climate that provides families with exceptional customer service and informational resources to create supportive environments that far extend the child's classroom.

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

Our faculty and staff have received professional development in social-emotional learning and collaborate in problem-solving teams alongside deans, guidance, and administrators to find amicable solutions to build relations with students and parents while meeting the needs of our diverse population of students. We host several events throughout the year to welcome parents to our campus so that positive relations may be established and
maintained among all stakeholders.