

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Creative Arts Academy Of St. Lucie



2022-23 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</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: 7/12/2022

<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>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
<b>2021-22 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>	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (44%)
<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>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## 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](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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Creative Arts Academy Of St. Lucie

1100 DELAWARE AVE, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	77%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

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**

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
Whitaker, Jane	Principal	Oversees daily operations to ensure the safety and academic success of all stakeholders, oversees school operating budget, Plans for continuous improvements related to school culture and developing strong community support. Serves as Chair of the Leadership Team, determines roles and responsibilities of all other members, creates the agenda, facilitates meetings and decision making, monitors to ensure members serve as instructional leaders in their respective roles, provides Professional Development, conducts classroom walk-throughs and observations and timely, purposeful feedback, participates and monitors team level collaborative planning and provides feedback to aide in improvements of instructional practice to directly impact and increase student achievement. solicits feedback from all stakeholders concerning matters related to the school and shares goals and data with all stakeholders to ensure common vision and common understanding
Gavoni, Vincia	Assistant Principal	Monitors to ensure members serve as instructional leaders in their respective roles, provides Professional Development, conducts classroom walk-throughs and observations with feedback, solicits feedback from all stakeholders concerning matters related to the school, and shares goals and data with all stakeholders to ensure common vision and common understanding. Oversees the school's discipline and classroom management programs, processes and structures. Supports teachers in implementing best classroom management practices in the classroom.
Clancey, Jenny	Administrative Support	MSAP Grant Fine Arts Specialist. Assists with fine arts program operations as related to the MSAP grant. Works closely with school administration and district personnel to implement grant objectives with fidelity. Assists with student enrollment and recruitment plan for the magnet program.
Ahill, Lillian	Instructional Media	To support students and teachers with literacy and technology.
Barnard, Elizabeth	School Counselor	Assists with the student scheduling. Assists in the coordination of Problem Solving Team meetings, oversees PBIS models and processes are followed and oversees the provision of behavioral intervention services. Assists with monitoring the processes of MTSS at the school through analyzing progress monitoring data and group creation, provides intervention resources and guidance, ensures fidelity in MTSS instruction. Additionally, oversees compliance of our ESOL program. Facilitates student support groups to meet the social-emotional needs of all stakeholders.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Henderson, Ashle	Administrative Support	Serves on the leadership team serving as school assessment coordinator and math specialist.
Brown, Tia	Dean	Assists with school discipline needs across all grade levels. Works closely with school administration to improve overall discipline and implementation of PBIS.
Phillips-Hill, Melissa	Teacher, ESE	Serves as ESE Specialists. Facilitates IEP meetings, oversees ESE schedules, monitors student services programs and works closely with district-level team to ensure all student needs and accommodations are being met with fidelity as outlined in their Individualized Education Plan.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 7/12/2022, Jane Whitaker

**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.*

1

**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**

33

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

497

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

8

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

5

**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	23	28	33	29	35	38	67	78	84	0	0	0	0	415
Attendance below 90 percent	6	11	8	8	7	9	20	20	24	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	10	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	14	9	26	23	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	7	20	11	24	31	0	0	0	0	103
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	16	0	0	0	0	37

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	0	0	4	8	15	13	33	29	0	0	0	0	102

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated  
 Sunday 8/21/2022

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	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

**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	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

**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	45%	53%	55%				46%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						54%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						49%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	44%	41%	42%				43%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	55%						41%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						30%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	40%	50%	54%				46%	58%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	55%	59%				56%	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	34%	50%	-16%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	48%	-8%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2022					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2022					
	2019	36%	49%	-13%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2022					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

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	36%	55%	-19%	62%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2022					
	2019	30%	47%	-17%	55%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
07	2022					
	2019	44%	50%	-6%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
08	2022					
	2019	53%	34%	19%	46%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	33%	46%	-13%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	64%	48%	16%	48%	16%
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	56%	67%	-11%	71%	-15%
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	75%	51%	24%	61%	14%
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	14	28	20	24	47	36	26	30			
ELL	39	44	23	47	49	39	22	42			
BLK	35	44	34	29	51	54	33	50	58		
HSP	51	49	35	51	52	44	40	70	64		
MUL	45			50							
WHT	53	54		61	67		48	67			
FRL	37	41	31	36	53	49	31	53	67		
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			
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		

**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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
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	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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%	1
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	58
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	43
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?**

Across grade levels we are seeing a decrease in levels of proficiency in reading and math. 4th grade and 6th grade students reflected an increase in proficiency in both reading and math, Their scores placed them in the top 5 schools within the district. Through CLP planning and improving instructional practices, monitoring student data and achievement we will see a significant improve across all grade levels in reading and math.

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

Reading proficiency scores reflected an overall decrease across grade levels with 40% proficiency, a decrease of 6%. There was also a 6% decrease in students making learning gains related to reading proficiency. Data also reflected a significant decline in the proficiency level of the lower quartile of students, demonstrating the greatest need for improvement across grade levels.

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

Contributing factors include inadequate small group instruction, differentiation, and monitoring of all students up to the actual testing days. There is also a need to deepen the effectiveness of Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) to improve general instructional practices across grade levels.

To address this need for improvement, the leadership team will need to closely monitor the implementation of small group instruction during the reading block. Students in the bottom quartile need to be identified and progress monitored through state Progress Monitoring and iReady. These assessments will aid data-driven decisions to improve student achievement and differentiate instruction effectively.

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

4th grade and 6th grade showed an increase in math and reading scores on the state assessments. Math proficiency school-wide improved by 1%, Math learning gains school-wide increased by 14%. Bottom quartile students improved by 23%. Additionally, Civics improved by 1% point.

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

After school tutoring was implemented to address individual student needs. Additionally, collaborative planning address the improvement of instructional practices and identifying student needs through interventions. Teachers identified targeted standards with the high need based on student data.

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

We will continue to build the effectiveness of collaborative planning across all grade levels. Progress monitoring will aid in effectively identifying student needs, resources, and interventions needed. Quality data chats and creating targeted reviews to monitor all student progress will allow us to make informed data-driven decisions.

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

The district will provide multiple learning opportunities for teachers related to collaborative planning and targeted subject professional development (i.e., BEST standards, Benchmark Curriculum, Civics, Reading, Math, Alg. 1). As needed, professional development opportunities will be provided throughout the school year to improve pedagogy at the school site.

Leadership will provide support and work with district partners to support teachers based on observations and continuous feedback.

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

The district will provide multiple learning opportunities for teachers related to collaborative planning, targeted subject professional development (i.e. BEST standards, Benchmark Curriculum, Civics, Reading, Math, Alg. 1)

Professional development opportunities are provided throughout the school year as needed to improve pedagogy.

Sustainability of improvement will supported by district and identifying teacher support based on observations and continuous feedback.

**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.**

Using systematic, Collaborative Planning processes so that teachers share an understanding of expectations for standards, curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Deepening teacher knowledge of the BEST standards to ensure effective instruction is provided to all students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of May 2023, ELA learning gains will increase from 40% to 51% to as measured by the FAST assessment for students in grades 3-8.

**Monitoring:**

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

Unit assessments, iReady diagnostic and PM1-3 will be monitored through collaborative planning during data chats.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Using established content standards, the teacher plans rigorous units with learning targets embedded within a performance scale/scope and sequence that demonstrates a progression of learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

If high quality standards-based instruction is provided to students meeting or exceeding the level of complexity then an increase in student achievement should be observed through various formative and summative assessments.

**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.

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group and small group instruction. Data will be continually reviewed to guide tiered support for students through the use of iReady data and Unit assessments, PM1-3

**Person Responsible**

Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on 2021-2022 FSA Math assessment students in grades 5 (18%) and 7 are well below proficiency. Our goal is to ensure that 51% reached proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of May 2023, Students currently in grades 6 and 8 will improve their level of proficiency above 51%

**Monitoring:**

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

Through unit assessment data, PM 1-3, iReady diagnostic, data chats, formative and summative assessments

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Tier 2 interventions will be implemented with fidelity in all grades 3-8. We will be focusing on grades 6 and 8 to improve their learning outcomes by monitoring their data through multiple means.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

New BEST standards in math are being implemented along with new math curriculum to improve math instruction. iReady will provide additional support in gauging student progress. Tier 2 interventions will be monitored to meet individual student needs.

**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.

Instructional coaches, district personnel and administration will support teachers during Collaborative Planning, through feedback of informal observations and by working with targeted small groups

**Person Responsible**

Jane Whitaker (jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org)

ESE Facilitated Support teachers will collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure they implement instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individuals.

**Person Responsible**

Melissa Phillips-Hill (melissa.phillips-hill@stlucieschools.org)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to systems in place that promotes positive student engagement**

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

Students need to have clear expectations established to improve the overall culture of the school.  
 Analysis of teacher and student climate surveys results reflected concerns connected to a sense of belonging and overall level of support that directly impacts student and teacher attendance, engagement, and discipline data.

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

Teacher and student climate surveys will improve in those areas of concern.

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

Leader in Me implementation, discipline data, attendance data, teacher and student observation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Vincia Gavoni (vincia.gavoni@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Explicit instruction of Leader in Me will be implemented the 7 Habits of Highly Effective Students. These activities will be monitored through on-going classroom monitoring. Additionally, the implementation of CHAMPS will be monitored as well.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Students need to have clear expectations established to improve the overall culture of the school.  
 Analysis of teacher and student climate surveys results reflected concerns connected to a sense of belonging and overall level of support that directly impacts student and teacher attendance, engagement, and discipline data.

**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.

Train staff in CHAMPS program  
 Implementations of CHAMPS

**Person Responsible**

Vincia Gavoni (vincia.gavoni@stlucieschools.org)

Implementation of PBIS initiative and activities to promote positive culture

**Person Responsible**

Vincia Gavoni (vincia.gavoni@stlucieschools.org)

Train all staff in the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People  
 Staff will participate in on-going Leader in Me trainings throughout the year  
 Teachers will utilize the Leader in Me pillars  
 Administration will monitor implementation of Leader in Me within classroom visits

**Person Responsible**

Vincia Gavoni (vincia.gavoni@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

Teachers will work collaboratively to ensure high-quality lessons are created to improve instructional practices and meet the academic needs of all students. Instructional resources include, but are not limited to Benchmark Advanced, Haggerty Phonics, Reading Horizons. Student progress and data will be monitored through iReady progress and diagnostic assessments, and Progress monitoring 1-3. Based on 21-22 data 35% of current 1st and 2nd graders are not proficient in reading. ESOL and SWD students will be closely monitored to ensure all accommodations are met and interventions are designed based on individual student needs. Multi-tiered support (MTSS) will be continually monitored through student data to make purposeful data-driven decisions to improve student achievement.

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

Of the 29 3rd grade students tested in 21-22SY, 59% of those students scored below Level 3. Of the 30 4th grade students who tested 40% of those students scored below a Level 3 in reading, and of the 35 5th graders who tested 60% scored below Level 3 in Reading. There will be a focus on effective collaborative planning for teachers to ensure high-quality lessons are created to improve instructional practices and meet the academic needs of all students. Student progress and data will be monitored through formative & summative assessments in addition to iReady diagnostic and progress monitoring. Based on 21-22 data approximately, 45% of current 4th and 5th grade students were not proficient in reading. ESOL and SWD students will be closely monitored to ensure all accommodations are met and interventions are designed based on individual student needs.



**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)**

By the end of 2023, 51% students in grades K-2 will show proficiency in ELA, This will be monitored through student achievement data including Progress Monitoring 1-3, iReady Diagnostic, and unit assessments. Student achievement data will be reviewed during weekly data chats and data walls will be created to monitor specific student needs. There will be focus on ESOL and SWD students to ensure learning gains are met or exceeded.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By the end of 2023, 51% of students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency in ELA This will be monitored through student achievement data including Progress Monitoring 1-3, iReady Diagnostic, and unit assessments. Student achievement data will be reviewed during weekly data chats and data walls will be created to monitor specific student needs. There will be focus on ESOL and SWD students to ensure learning gains are met or exceeded.

**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.

This area of focus will be monitored using formative and summative assessments, iReady diagnostic and Growth

Monitoring, K-5 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring. Weekly data chats will be utilized to ensure all students are being closely monitored and achievement is tracked. Data walls will be designed to ensure student growth is achieved.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Whitaker, Jane, jane.whitaker@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?

Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our 4th and 5th grade 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. We utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. - Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons  
 These materials and resources are aligned to the BEST ELA Standards, as well as the district designed scope and sequence.

**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?

Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction and differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. Multiple literacy resources support interventions/differentiation (Haggerty, LLi, Reading Horizons) have proven record of effectiveness for the targeted population of students to promote reading proficiency across grade levels.

**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
Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group and small group instruction. Data will be continually reviewed to guide tiered support for students through the use of iReady data, Unit assessments, and State Progress Monitoring 1-3.	Dowell, Lloren, lloren.dowell@stlucieschools.org
Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback to improve instructional practice.	Dowell, Lloren, lloren.dowell@stlucieschools.org
Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention	Whitaker, Jane, jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org
On-going Professional learning to improve instructional practices	Whitaker, Jane, jane.whitaker@stlucieschools.org
On-going monitoring of assessment data across all grade level	Henderson, Ashlee, ashlee.henderson@stlucieschools.org
Implementation of family Literacy events and activities to improve reading proficiency across all grade levels	Dowell, Lloren, lloren.dowell@stlucieschools.org
Students will track academic progress through implementation of data folders	Whitaker, Jane, jane.whitaker@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.

CAST strives to build a positive school culture as a PBIS model school, through establishing clear classroom expectations school-wide to include CAST expectations as well as CHAMPS. CAST aligns its vision to the Kids at Hope philosophy. Our school continues to excel in the state’s PBIS program. Our Assistant Principal and guidance counselor oversee the PBIS initiatives. Our PBIS committee meets monthly. This committee is made up of representatives from each grade level to continually review the needs of our students and implement activities that engage students in improving the overall culture and environment of the school. Discipline data is reviewed and monthly incentives are determined during the meetings. Committee members communicate with their teams and students to help make decisions about the incentives. As a Leader in Me School, CAST seeks to effectively implement the 7-habits for highly effective teens to aid in character and leadership development. The school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing counseling, mentoring and other services. We believe that

when schools and families work together, children have a far better chance of being successful both in school and in life. A strong home to school connection sets the stage for a child who will grow up with a love for learning. Parents and community members are invited to join us at our PTO and School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, curriculum nights, reward ceremonies, parent meetings, and numerous other events and volunteer opportunities.

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

Establishing a positive school culture and environment begins with establishing quality relationships with all stakeholders. School-wide Coaching impacts the overall success of the school through 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.

School-wide Coaches Include:

Administrators

Instructional Coaches

Dean

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.