

St. Lucie Public Schools

Samuel S. Gaines Academy Of Emerging Technologies



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Samuel S. Gaines Academy Of Emerging Technologies

2250 S JENKINS RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

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

Demographics

Principal: Keith Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 10/16/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (48%)
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	N/A
* 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 10/11/2022.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Samuel S. Gaines Academy Of Emerging Technologies

2250 S JENKINS RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Davis, Keith	Principal	Direct and manage instructional program and supervise operations and personnel at school base. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all school based activities.
Rodriguez, Amy	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and school based level operations. Coordinate assigned student activities. Responsible Middle School ELA, Social Studies, and Elementary grades 1,4
Davino, John	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and school based level operations. Coordinate assigned student activities. Responsible Middle School Math, Science, and Elementary grades K, 2, 5
Powers, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Responsible Science, Math, and STEM advocates
Cuccurollo, Kerrie	Reading Coach	K-8 Reading Coach-Lead Data Chats, Collaborative Learning Planning

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/16/2017, Keith Davis

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

27

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

836

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

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	47	55	51	74	80	111	64	114	119	0	0	0	0	715
Attendance below 90 percent	14	14	11	18	32	34	10	38	42	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	6	15	25	5	30	20	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	35	42	7	33	15	0	0	0	0	132
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	38	55	11	24	15	0	0	0	0	151
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	0	3	2	3	33	65	54	0	0	0	0	162

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	6	39	50	18	55	40	0	0	0	0	212

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	3	0	2	30	49	36	42	49	43	0	0	0	0	254	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	0	2	30	49	36	42	49	43	0	0	0	0	254

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	53%	55%				36%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						55%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						50%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	53%	41%	42%				45%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	60%						58%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						52%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	50%	50%	54%				37%	58%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	55%	59%				55%	74%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	33%	50%	-17%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	27%	51%	-24%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	30%	48%	-18%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
06	2022					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
07	2022					
	2019	31%	49%	-18%	52%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	27%	47%	-20%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
06	2022					
	2019	55%	47%	8%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
07	2022					
	2019	43%	50%	-7%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	34%	8%	46%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	32%	46%	-14%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	38%	48%	-10%	48%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	55%	67%	-12%	71%	-16%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	51%	44%	61%	34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	35	44	35	38	48	39	27	63			
ELL	41	52	55	50	58	50	38	80	94		
BLK	44	52	60	43	54	42	43	77	100		
HSP	48	55	51	56	62	58	53	82	96		
MUL	50	80		83	80						
WHT	56	64		63	62		59	100			
FRL	44	53	54	48	56	52	48	80	94		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	42	42	28	54	48	26	37			
ELL	34	53	60	36	38	38	28	64	67		
BLK	36	51	51	32	41	43	33	62	90		
HSP	44	56	56	46	47	39	42	71	81		
MUL	44	57		50	64						
WHT	54	54	36	59	68	86	63	58	91		
FRL	41	54	54	40	46	46	41	64	83		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	41	33	24	53	48	21	27			
ELL	27	51	48	40	52	50	27	37			
BLK	29	50	48	30	56	52	21	45	92		
HSP	39	56	53	53	59	55	43	63	96		
MUL	36	40		50	55						
WHT	41	72	50	57	65		44	67			
FRL	34	55	54	41	58	55	32	52	92		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	622
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	0
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%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

ELA- We have an upward trend in proficiency. Our data in learning gains and bottom quartile had minor increased.

Math- We have an upward trend in proficiency. Our data in learning gains and bottom quartile had minor increased.

Science & Social Studies have maintained an upward trend in proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest need for improvement is our bottom quartile. We need to focus on our learning gains in both Math and ELA.

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 contributing factors for this need for improvement was the transition back to brick and mortar education and new ELA Curriculum for the district. Our action to address this need for improvement is a focus on curriculum instruction through Professional Development and Collaborative Learning and Planning with Instructional Coaches. In addition, we have a K-4 ELA Interventionist and a 5-8 ELA Interventionist who will work closely with our Tier 3 students to increase learning gains.. In math, we will use iReady to support students on their pathway to increase their level and achieve learning gains. We will further use that data to provide small group support.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Civics and Science showed improvement compared to previous years cohorts

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

The contributing factors for the improvement were the focus on vocabulary using real world solutions. Camps supporting content areas during summer and prior to testing. Lastly, Penda was implemented as an additional support for students in 5th and 8th grade Science.

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

Students will need support in ELA testing strategies, such as context clues and access to content earlier. We will also focus on small group differentiation and remediation in ELA and Math.

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

District training will continue to support the BEST Standards and our new ELA and Math curriculums. The school will adjust the schedule to provide professional development opportunities.

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

Small group Instruction
On-going Professional Development
Continued camps and tutoring opportunities for students

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our learning gains and bottom quartile showed the smallest increase from previous years outcomes. Our area of focus will be to increase gains in these two areas.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will increase our learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The area of focus will be monitored by using the FAST Progress Monitoring tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence based strategy that will be used is small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We will use Benchmark Advance and iReady has our resources.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No description entered

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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

Person Responsible

Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible

Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible

Amy Rodriguez (amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Differentiate instruction will be utilized during the Reading Block and MTSS Intervention.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Differentiate instruction will be utilized during the Reading Block and MTSS Intervention.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of students in grades k-2 will be on grade level by the end of the 2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of students in grades k-2 will be on grade level by the end of the 2023 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Students in grades K-2 will make learning gains based on iReady and FAST Progress Monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rodriguez, Amy, amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We are using Florida Benchmark Advance and iReady as our evidence-based programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These are the programs that are provided by the district to address the areas of need.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

Weekly Literacy Walks with Leadership team to observe whole group and small group tier 1 instruction.

Identify instructional strategies to support for coaching cycles and Professional Development opportunities

Weekly Data chats to review tier 1 data with all grade levels

Schedule Professional development throughout the school year

Rodriguez, Amy,
amy.rodriguez@stlucieschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

According to our staff survey results

We outpaced the District in all areas

School Culture SGAET 68% District 55%

Leadership SGAET 76% District 75%

Workforce Engagement SGAET 76% District 75%

Stakeholder Input SGAET 64% District 58%

Safety SGAET 66% District 49%

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

- Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is clean and well-maintained(WE)

- Opportunities are available for parents to express their concerns and propose solutions to improve the school(SI)

- Teachers have influence over evaluating and grading their students(SI)

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

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

Our faculty and staff retention has maintained over 70%

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

St. Lucie - 0141 - Samuel S. Gaines Academy - 2021-22 SIP

Last Modified: 8/19/2022 <https://www.floridacims.org> Page 23 of 24

SGAET has embraced Leader In Me which allow students to transition from extrinsic to intrinsic rewards. Leader In Me is part of our Cultural and Learning Environment or adults and students, it is based on Covey's Seven Habits. Our students have a minimum of 30 minutes in Circles, with different topics ranging from personal and academic to world impact. Our consultant visits and progress monitor Single School Culture. She is often sharing how she shares our school story.

We have several staff members enrolling their children in our school. Which is great measure of culture.