Lincoln Park Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lincoln Park Academy

1806 AVENUE I, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Herrington

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
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: A (71%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (65%)
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

Lincoln Park Academy

1806 AVENUE I, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

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)
High School 6-12	Yes	45%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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 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 Lincoln Park Academy is to ensure that all students graduate from our safe and caring school, and are equipped with knowledge, academic skills and the desire to succeed as life long learners and positive contributors to our diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lincoln Park Academy will be a premier college preparatory secondary school that prepares all students for post-secondary placement through challenging, engaging, and satisfying work that enables every student to continuously improve in all academic areas. Teachers will work together collaboratively as part of a dynamic community engaged in learning and designing quality work for students. The curriculum will require annual mastery of the core academics and will provide elective subjects to enhance student development. A partnership will exist with parents and the community, that fosters citizenship, self-reliance, and character development.

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
Sanabria, Henry	Principal	
Stone, Candace	Assistant Principal	
Sloan, James	Assistant Principal	
Octavi, Lynda	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Michelle Herrington

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.*
4

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.*
16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
79

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,612

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
10

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	284	276	258	218	220	189	200	1645
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	52	44	26	29	28	35	257
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	17	18	7	6	2	1	70
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	31	42	23	38	14	7	179
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	18	58	39	35	15	3	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	54	36	16	27	13	0	190
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	57	54	41	31	3	2	263
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	30	8	0	0	1	0	64

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	69	69	64	45	47	21	6	321

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	5	1	7	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	283	274	258	219	220	178	175	1607
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	290	4	28	10	23	21	32	408
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	11	11	14	6	1	59
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	51	9	1	0	0	62
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	29	12	12	3	9	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	35	22	17	25	13	5	377
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	62	27	13	25	12	10	183

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	1	0	0	2	3	2	8

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	283	274	258	219	220	178	175	1607
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	290	4	28	10	23	21	32	408
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	11	11	14	6	1	59
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	51	9	1	0	0	62
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	29	12	12	3	9	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	35	22	17	25	13	5	377
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	62	27	13	25	12	10	183

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
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	1	0	0	2	3	2	8

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				75%	51%	56%	75%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	48%	51%	60%	52%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	36%	42%	49%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				70%	40%	51%	70%	40%	51%
Math Learning Gains				62%	41%	48%	59%	47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	38%	45%	48%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				82%	71%	68%	79%	68%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				83%	68%	73%	83%	62%	71%

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
06	2021					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	75%	49%	26%	52%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2021					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
09	2021					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	55%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
10	2021					
	2019	80%	51%	29%	53%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	58%	47%	11%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	78%	50%	28%	54%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	16%	34%	-18%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	72%	48%	24%	48%	24%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	71%	22%	67%	26%

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	82%	67%	15%	71%	11%

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	85%	68%	17%	70%	15%

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	73%	51%	22%	61%	12%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	80%	55%	25%	57%	23%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was compiled and provided by the district office.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63	30	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	25	42
	Students With Disabilities	47	29	26
	English Language Learners	16	11	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57	56	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	47	53
	Students With Disabilities	33	70	65
	English Language Learners	10	50	50

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67	53	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	61	44	36
	Students With Disabilities	52	16	9
	English Language Learners	30	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	26	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	22	19
	Students With Disabilities	30	10	20
	English Language Learners	20	0	0
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60	30	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	22	37
	Students With Disabilities	15	5	18
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	69	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	64	67	68
	Students With Disabilities	57	50	50
	English Language Learners	25	75	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	33	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	30	27
	Students With Disabilities	33	33	22
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	57	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	49	46
	Students With Disabilities	29	14	36
	English Language Learners	0	25	0

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74	79	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	72	64
	Students With Disabilities	31	39	31
	English Language Learners	25	50	20
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	61	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	57	63
	Students With Disabilities	29	29	65
	English Language Learners	50	33	83
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77	91	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	85	65
	Students With Disabilities	62	69	39
	English Language Learners	0	57	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	49	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	39	41
	Students With Disabilities	33	14	8
	English Language Learners	38	15	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74	71	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	71	63	69
	Students With Disabilities	27	29	39
	English Language Learners	11	42	54
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	81	89	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	79	88	84
	Students With Disabilities	63	88	75
	English Language Learners	0	100	100

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	29	37	29	24	26	17	40	38		100	75
ELL	30	31	17	26	23	22	25	29			
ASN	91	73		89	58		95	95	87	100	100
BLK	56	53	36	38	27	25	54	64	77	100	82
HSP	66	54	27	51	30	25	59	76	64	98	91

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
MUL	87	63		69	34		80	75	100		
WHT	72	60	40	63	37	30	80	82	80	100	88
FRL	60	52	34	43	31	26	59	68	71	100	81
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	30	43	38	39	53	50	50	63	35		
ELL	32	61	55	37	46	50	31	57			
ASN	95	87		97	65		96	94	76	100	100
BLK	63	58	46	54	57	48	67	72	64	100	68
HSP	80	67	65	71	58	59	83	90	59	100	89
MUL	83	66		69	67	45	82		67		
WHT	77	63	48	79	67	59	90	86	56	99	67
FRL	68	60	51	63	58	52	76	76	60	100	70
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	31	42	42	42	43	27	48	54		100	30
ELL	13	23	28	23	38	48					
ASN	96	67		97	76		100	95	82		
BLK	63	58	47	53	51	41	70	72	56	100	69
HSP	78	62	49	72	58	58	70	85	64	100	87
MUL	82	71	73	60	62	23	89	76	53		
WHT	79	60	50	78	63	55	85	88	57	99	80
FRL	68	58	47	63	55	44	73	76	59	99	70

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	725
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	88
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	55
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	57
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	73
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	67
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	56
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?

We noticed that there was a significant drop across all content areas from the 2021 testing year. In particular, we are looking to address the drops in ELA proficiency and math proficiency, learning gains, and bottom 25 learning gains. ELA Proficiency had a drop of 9 points, from 75% to 66%. Math proficiency had a 18 point drop, from 70% to 52%. Math learning gains had a 29% drop, from a 62% to 33%, and Bottom 25 learning gains had a 27 point drop, from a 54% to a 27%.

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

The areas with need for greatest improvement are ELA proficiency and math proficiency, learning gains, and bottom 25 learning gains. ELA Proficiency had a drop of 9 points, from 75% to 66%. Math proficiency had a 18 point drop, from 70% to 52%. Math learning gains had a 29% drop, from a 62% to 33%, and Bottom 25 learning gains had a 27 point drop, from a 54% to a 27%.

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

We feel that the main contributing factors were students who opted for virtual learning. We finished the year at nearly 38% of our student population still participating in virtual learning. The new actions include having all students on campus, better utilizing our reading coach and adding a math interventionalist.

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

The most improved area from the 2019 assessment was bottom 25 learning gains in math. There as a 6 point increase, from a 48% to a 54%.

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

The contributing factor to that increase was the ability of school to double block our low bottom 25 math students.

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

The first focus will be on students that have been in the same level 1 bucket for the past two testing years in mathematics (i.e. 1.1 - 1.1, 1.2 -1.2, and 1.3 - 1.3). For example, a student that was a 1.1 in the 2019 SY and is till a 1.1 in the 2021 SY. These students have been identified and will be pulled for Tier 2 intervention. The second focus will be on those students who dropped out of proficiency in ELA. The Instructional coach will be working with the ELA and Reading teaches to look at instructional strategies within the classroom.

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 major professional development will focus on the book by John Maxwell, Change your World.

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

As per the district, interventionalist are a two year position so that will allow us to have that support for at least next year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We saw a significant drop in the ELA proficiency. ELA Proficiency had a drop of 9 points, from 75% to 66%.
Measurable Outcome:	The plan is for ELA proficiency to get back to the previous level of 75% from the current level of 66%
Monitoring:	Progress towards this goal will be monitored through unit assessment data, formative and summative classroom assessments. In addition, iReady and Achieve 3000 data will be used to monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Candace Stone (candace.stone@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of the Instructional coach will focus on support of the ELA and Reading teachers. In addition, the use of CLP meetings and data chats will allow us to focus on Tier 1 instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is expectations from the district office.

Action Steps to Implement	
Instructional coach will create a schedule and plan to meet with identified teachers and grade groups.	
Person Responsible	Candace Stone (candace.stone@stlucieschools.org)
Monitor CLP meetings and data chats	
Person Responsible	Candace Stone (candace.stone@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We saw a significant decrease in proficiency, learning gains and bottom 25 learn gains this past school year. Math proficiency had an 18 point drop, from 70% to 52%. Math learning gains had a 29% drop, from a 62% to 33%, and Bottom 25 learning gains had a 27 point drop, from a 54% to a 27%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to bring the scores back to the levels of the of the 2018 school year. Moving proficiency to 70% from 52%, learning gains to 58% from 33% and bottom 25 learning gains to 48% from 27%.
Monitoring:	Progress towards this goal will be monitored through unit assessment data, formative and summative classroom assessments, and any other assessments available to us.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Sloan (james.sloan@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We have hired a math interventionalist who will have a focus on working with our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to achieve gains. In addition, the use of CLP meetings and data chats will allow us to focus on Tier 1 instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is expectations from the district office.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coach will create a plan for pulling Tier 2 groups

Person Responsible	James Sloan (james.sloan@stlucieschools.org)

Monitoring of CLP and data chat meetings.

Person Responsible	James Sloan (james.sloan@stlucieschools.org)

#3. -- 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, 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.

Based off of the data provided by SafeSchoolsforAlex we have identified the area of violent incidents as a primary area of concern for the school year. The hope is that with SEL we will be able to support students with self control when situations arise that cause tensions.

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.

The school works at building positive relationships with families through the many opportunities for parental involvement, including academic, athletic, social, and performances. Parents are contacted regarding specific student conduct, student achievements, as well as ongoing communication about student progress. Parents are also encouraged to participate in parent groups which are actively involved in the school.

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

Overall, all faculty and staff are stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment. Specifically, the PBIS Team is tasked with identifying ways to increase the culture and environment at the school. In addition, those teachers who facilitate SEL also have a prominent role in this.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00