

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Creative Arts Academy Of St. Lucie



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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>27</b>

## Creative Arts Academy Of St. Lucie

1100 DELAWARE AVE, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/cast/>

### Demographics

**Principal: Jane Whitaker**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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)	77%
<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: C (48%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (51%)
<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, [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](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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>27</b>

## Creative Arts Academy Of St. Lucie

1100 DELAWARE AVE, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/cast/>

### 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	64%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	80%

### School Grades History

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

The Mission of the Creative Arts Academy of St. Lucie is promoting excellence in academics, arts and leadership.

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

The Creative Arts Academy of St. Lucie will create an engaging and enjoyable culture where students are provided with the necessary skills that will cause them to excel to the top in all areas of the academics and the arts. As students acquire these skills, they will broaden their perspectives as well as adhere to a healthier approach to life. Once these skills are obtained, students will be prepared then to be accepted to the colleges/universities of their choice, to be successful at those institutions of higher learning, and to become a successful and productive member of society.

### 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
Rampone, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	
Athill, Lillian	Instructional Media	To support students and teachers with literacy.
Kenney, Hannah	School Counselor	Provide Social Emotional Learning support to students and staff to help support a single school culture. Problem solve with the leadership team about student SEL and attendance barriers that affect student achievement.
Gavoni, Vincia	Assistant Principal	Monitor and ensure that the school improvement plan is carried out with fidelity. Assist the principal in serving as an instructional leader responsible for educational decisions, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parental involvement and revising policies and procedures on campus. Assist principal in managing all daily operations of the school. Serve as the discipline officer.
Reid, Lori Anne	Principal	Monitor and ensure that the school improvement plan is carried out with fidelity. Serves as instructional leaders responsible for educational decisions, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parental involvement and revise policies and procedures on campus. Manage all daily operations of the school.
Johnson, James	Instructional Coach	To plan, organize and implement an appropriate instructional math and science programs in an elementary or secondary learning environment that guides and encourages students to develop and fulfill their academic potential. Work is performed under the supervision of the principal.
Roti, Mary	Teacher, K-12	To facilitate the SIP process and SAC.
Clancey, Jenny	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Support MSAP grant

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 8/23/2021, Jane Whitaker

**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.*

2



**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.*

11

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

49

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

433

**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	24	28	34	31	36	37	71	84	88	0	0	0	0	433	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	6	1	9	17	25	21	22	0	0	0	0	113	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	10	3	0	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	18	15	0	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	9	19	0	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	13	9	26	34	11	0	0	0	0	99	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	11	16	32	37	33	0	0	0	0	135	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	0	7	12	11	35	44	23	0	0	0	0	135	

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

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

Monday 8/23/2021

## 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	27	35	20	32	38	58	96	105	65	0	0	0	0	476
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	4	3	1	8	13	21	16	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	2	2	8	10	7	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	14	12	23	12	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	27	37	23	0	0	0	0	98

**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	10	4	4	3	15	30	43	23	0	0	0	0	132

**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	1	0	0	1	0	0	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	27	35	20	32	38	58	96	105	65	0	0	0	0	476	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	4	3	1	8	13	21	16	0	0	0	0	76	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	2	2	8	10	7	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	14	12	23	12	0	0	0	0	63	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	27	37	23	0	0	0	0	98	

#### 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	10	4	4	3	15	30	43	23	0	0	0	0	132	

#### 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	1	0	0	1	0	0	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				46%	60%	61%	39%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	58%	59%	56%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	54%	49%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				43%	58%	62%	41%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				41%	56%	59%	37%	57%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	46%	52%	30%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				46%	58%	56%	27%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				56%	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	34%	50%	-16%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	48%	-8%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2021					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2021					
	2019	36%	49%	-13%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	62%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2021					
	2019	30%	47%	-17%	55%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
07	2021					
	2019	44%	50%	-6%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
08	2021					
	2019	53%	34%	19%	46%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	33%	46%	-13%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	64%	48%	16%	48%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

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	56%	67%	-11%	71%	-15%
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	26	23	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	16	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	20	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	16	13
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	14	14	17
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	30	93
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	19	91
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	75
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82	85	93
	Economically Disadvantaged	76	81	91
	Students With Disabilities	75	75	75
	English Language Learners	25	100	100

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	72	78	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	71	75	91
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	0
	English Language Learners	64	73	82
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	81	88	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	79	83	87
	Students With Disabilities	50	100	0
	English Language Learners	82	82	82
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69	78	93
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	68	71
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	50
	English Language Learners	25	75	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	64	75	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	64	65
	Students With Disabilities	17	50	60
	English Language Learners	50	75	75

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	73	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	69	100
	Students With Disabilities	0	40	0
	English Language Learners	17	57	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	79	88	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	85	87	80
	Students With Disabilities	40	100	100
	English Language Learners	67	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	63	72	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	53	63
	Students With Disabilities	75	60	100
	English Language Learners	57	86	86
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49	43	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	41	44
	Students With Disabilities	9	17	17
	English Language Learners	20	11	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	56	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	53	36
	Students With Disabilities	36	33	43
	English Language Learners	10	33	22



Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	51	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	46	43
	Students With Disabilities	23	36	44
	English Language Learners	0	9	29
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	45	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	42	40
	Students With Disabilities	9	21	33
	English Language Learners	18	18	33
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	16	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	12	10
	Students With Disabilities	25	15	31
	English Language Learners	9	0	0

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	61	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	57	57
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	20
	English Language Learners	0	25	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	40	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	28	28
	Students With Disabilities	14	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	25	25
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	38	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	38	49
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	38
	English Language Learners	0	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	14	24	21	24	38	37	9	57			
ELL	33	32	13	36	36	36	38	38			
BLK	33	36	36	29	36	30	25	49			
HSP	51	38	18	46	42	40	45	64			
MUL	63	46		53	42						
WHT	53	52	36	61	47		76	75			
FRL	40	39	28	37	38	29	41	48	80		
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	10	50	50	20	46	36	10				
ELL	24	39	45	27	29	23	25				
BLK	32	51	49	27	35	28	30	59			

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	55	60	57	56	45	23	57				
MUL	60			50							
WHT	58	56		55	48		53				
FRL	42	47	38	37	36	34	45	58	73		
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	16	42	38	10	20	16					
ELL	12	43	47	35	40	30					
BLK	33	50	50	35	30	27	22	39			
HSP	41	53	33	49	51	58	21	50			
MUL	46	83		38	15						
WHT	50	69	64	44	44		40				
FRL	37	55	47	39	37	31	26	44	64		

### 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	35
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	51
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	57
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	43
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?

7th grade ELA learning gains showed the lowest performance for all subgroups. Sixth grade math students in all subgroups performed the lowest in proficiency and learning gains.

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

ELA learning gains and the bottom 25%

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

The greatest decline was in ELA learning gains. We decreased from 54% to 41% showing a 13% decrease. The decline could be from the lack of differentiated instruction and students not receiving face to face instruction. Additionally the bottom 25% learning gains decreased from 46% to 32%. Face to face instruction and differentiated instruction are actions to address these areas.

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

Middle School Acceleration showed the most improvement from 71% to 76%

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

Strong progress monitoring and differentiated instruction.

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

Collaborative Planning will set the basis to accelerate learning. Planning focused on the intent of the standards, alignment of material, planning for instruction and data tracking. Collaborative planning will include planning for differentiated instruction.

#### 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.

Professional development activities will include the following: CLP process professional development, BEST standards, LLI.

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

After school tutoring.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Using systematic, collaborative planning processes so that teachers share an understanding of expectations for standards, curriculum, assessment, and instruction.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By May of 2022, ELA learning gains will increase from 41% to 60% as measured by FSA for students in grades 4-8.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Unit assessment results will be monitored through collaborative planning data chats.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Using established content standards, the teacher plans rigorous units with learning targets embedded within a performance scale that demonstrates a progression of learning.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	If standards based instruction is provided to students, where the intent of the standard along with the complexity of the standard based on the achievement level descriptors for proficiency, then students will increase achievement.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Build teacher capacity of content knowledge of standards through collaborative planning and instructional coaching.
2. Create a master schedule that includes ESE Support facilitator teachers in collaborative planning sessions.
3. Set planning protocols and expectations for collaborative planning sessions.
4. Schedule collaborative planning for all grade level subject areas.
5. Utilize walk-through data to identify and prioritize teachers in need of additional instructional coaching support.
6. Provide training for ELL paraprofessionals in standards-based instruction along with teacher support.
7. Differentiated instructions targeting additional support for the following sub groups: ELL, SWD and Black/African American.

**Person Responsible** Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Analysis of teacher and student climate survey results, student discipline data, the number of mental health referrals and staff and student attendance data indicate a need to address the social emotional learning needs of our school.

**Measurable Outcome:** Student perception of sense of belonging and safety will increase by 25% as measured by the student climate survey.

**Monitoring:** A Leader in me Light House Leadership team will monitor the lessons and implementation of Leader in Me .

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Vincia Gavoni (vincia.gavoni@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Explicit instruction of Leader in Me will be implemented to teach students the 7 Habits of Highly Effect Students. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walkthrough tools.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our students are lacking many of these basic 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**

1. Obtain Leader in Me Program
2. Train all staff in the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People
3. Train all staff on Core 1, 2 and 3 for implementation of Leader in Me
4. Schedule time in the master schedule for SEL time to include Leader in Me curriculum implantation.
5. Teachers will implement the Leader in Me program
6. Administration will monitor implementation with classroom visits.

**Person Responsible** Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA assessment, students in 4th grade are at below 50% for proficiency in ELA. Our 4th grader scored at 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, K-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Brittany Rampone (brittany.rampone@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** Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible** Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible** Lori Anne Reid (lori.reid@stlucieschools.org)



**#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Monitoring:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***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.

**After engaging in performance diagnostics to get to the root cause of a number of our behavioral issues, we have come to the conclusion that a number of teachers have not been formally trained in classroom management; as such, on-going classroom management training and coaching will be provided. If we are going to bring out the best in the students, we must focus on bringing out the best in the teachers. The following sources of data will be used as leading and lagging indicators to monitor the school culture and environment:**

**# of teachers who have been trained in classroom management****# of teachers who have completed a classroom management plan****# of teachers who have expectations visibly posted****# of teachers who have formally taught their plan to the students****# of students who can state expectations during a given activity****# of teachers observed recognizing students following expectations at a 4:1 ratio****# of teachers observed increasing the use of questioning strategies to engage students****# of staff observed at their posts during transitions****# of classrooms that can be observed transitioning appropriately****# of teachers indicating increased levels of satisfaction on the climate survey****# of parent complaints****# of codes (calls for assistance) to the classroom for misbehavior****# of ODRs****# of suspensions****# of requests for law enforcement**

## 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.

In short, culture is shared behavior, or "the way we do things around here". That is the behavior of the students, the behavior of the staff and faculty, and the behavior of the school leaders. Schools cannot lead by results alone and focusing on results only is a sure way to elicit unethical behavior as some people will seek out the quickest road to reward regardless of the moral implications. To maintain the highest level of ethics, all behaviors (i.e. student, staff, faculty, leadership, etc.) must be aligned to the results, with both leading and lagging indicators established as measures of progress. And if a positive culture is desired, then positive reinforcement must be used to bring out the best in all people. There is no positive culture without positive reinforcement. In other words, teachers must focus on bringing out the best in students through teaching and the use of data to positively reinforce progress towards goals; similarly, those who support faculty must focus on bringing out the best in them through teaching (many do not possess the required behavior management skills) and the use of data to positively reinforce their progress towards established goals! One of the areas that has negatively impact the school's culture is school discipline issues. Supporting teachers with getting their classroom "up and running" at the beginning of the school year in terms of classroom management is critical to the culture of the school and the academic success of students. The first few weeks can make or break the school's culture. This is particularly true in many schools that have historically struggled with misbehavior because many teachers coming into the field have received little to no training in classroom management. As such, CAST will focus on a) training teachers and staff and, b) coaching teachers and staff in classroom management. Ongoing training will include opportunities for increased practice with feedback as teachers and staff have the opportunity to work through performance-based tasks and scenario-based training. CAST will focus on a) training teachers and staff and, b) coaching teachers and staff. c) Providing feedback to teachers regarding office managed offences. d) Norm behaviors through single school culture. e) Creating a suggestion box for teachers and staff to provide feedback. f) quarterly culture surveys to address the needs of teachers. g) Ongoing communication with faculty and staff to build and environment of trust, respect and high expectations.

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

Coaching - building coaching capacity rooted in the delivery of positive reinforcement and increasing the number of educators who have the ability to provide classroom management coaching of this type This will reduce discipline issues while simultaneously improving the culture. The identified "coach" will assess the needs of each teacher (e.g. use an ecological checklist), support with the development or refinement of their classroom management plan, support with identifying goals, then provide ongoing feedback and

encouragement related to targeted classroom management skills in order to bridge this gap between training and real world application. The identified stakeholders below will provide a productive and supporting role to all teachers and faculty in order to promote a positive school culture.

Coaches Include:

Administrators

Dean

Instructional Coaches

School Counselors

ESE Specialist

Lead teachers/mentors

District Personnel (when Possible), including:

Professional developers

Content Specialist

Program specialists

Social workers

Discipline issues frequently lead to feelings of inadequacy, frustration, and ultimately, a culture that might be described as negative. Bringing out the best in students requires bringing out the best in teachers. To do this, they must be equipped with the tools necessary to create a positive classroom culture, and then they must be supported by "coaches" who primarily apply positive reinforcement in order support the teachers and strengthen relationships that will lead to a "positive" school culture.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00