Liberty Pines Academy

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Liberty Pines Academy

10901 RUSSELL SAMPSON RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-lpa.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Donny Hoessler

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	13%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (72%) 2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
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 is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

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

Liberty Pines Academy

10901 RUSSELL SAMPSON RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-lpa.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

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 KG-8	No	13%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

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.

Liberty Pines Academy (LPA) will provide a high-quality educational experience by continually building the instructional capacity of our teachers and developing meaningful relationships with our students, staff, and community. Students and staff will implement and use instructional strategies that foster critical thinking and problem solving through real-world learning experiences. LPA is a place where everyone is respectful, responsible, ready to learn, and focused on creating positive relationships.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Liberty Pines Academy is to ensure high levels of learning and expectations for all students and staff. Through our continuous collaborative effort, students will have character, knowledge, and skills essential to pursuing their goals and dreams successfully throughout their lives.

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
Hoessler, Donny	Principal	
McCool, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Glennon, Erin	Assistant Principal	
Ashcroft, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	
Langowski, Krista	Instructional Coach	
Ryan, Sherry	Teacher, K-12	
Raya, Staci	Teacher, K-12	
Hoelle, Diana	Teacher, K-12	
Carroll, Necia	Teacher, K-12	
Frank, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Veniard, Amber	Teacher, ESE	
Cox, Kelley	School Counselor	
Johnson, Penny	Teacher, K-12	
Martin, Alex	Teacher, K-12	
Hale, Donna	Teacher, K-12	
Herkel, Jill	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Donny Hoessler

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.*

6

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.*

24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

122

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,801

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

12

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

18

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	122	173	160	153	154	123	192	188	170	0	0	0	0	1435
Attendance below 90 percent	9	4	10	7	7	7	12	15	21	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	1	3	6	9	8	12	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	9	0	0	0	0	27
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	1	17	10	16	15	11	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	4	6	1	17	10	16	15	11	0	0	0	0	83

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	2	0	2	3	6	13	12	0	0	0	0	38

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	1	2	3	4	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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	124	145	143	150	160	155	172	188	192	0	0	0	0	1429
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	0	6	2	3	13	17	21	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	5	5	8	14	14	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	14	9	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	1	6	19	13	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	3	4	7	1	3	8	3	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	124	145	143	150	160	155	172	188	192	0	0	0	0	1429
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	0	6	2	3	13	17	21	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	5	5	8	14	14	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	14	9	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	1	6	19	13	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	3	4	7	1	3	8	3	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	76%	75%	55%				79%	84%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						66%	67%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						58%	61%	54%
Math Achievement	86%	45%	42%				87%	88%	62%
Math Learning Gains	76%						74%	71%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						64%	66%	52%
Science Achievement	76%	81%	54%				77%	77%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	71%	59%				94%	95%	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	77%	78%	-1%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	76%	3%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2022					
	2019	78%	74%	4%	54%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
07	2022					
	2019	72%	72%	0%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
08	2022					
	2019	84%	71%	13%	56%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

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	86%	82%	4%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	89%	82%	7%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2022					

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	74%	80%	-6%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
06	2022					
	2019	87%	74%	13%	55%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
07	2022					
	2019	85%	80%	5%	54%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
08	2022					
	2019	90%	78%	12%	46%	44%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	68%	73%	-5%	53%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	84%	72%	12%	48%	36%
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	94%	90%	4%	71%	23%
			HISTORY EOC		
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	79%	18%	61%	36%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%

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	39	39	37	57	63	56	52	68			
ELL	46	54	47	83	74	83	69				
ASN	93	77		99	91		90	94	95		
BLK	66	52	25	74	73	75	29				
HSP	65	50	43	79	73	74	67	83	46		
MUL	82	60		86	71	58	79	94			
WHT	76	56	48	87	75	67	78	93	72		
FRL	60	50	39	75	68	73	58	87	57		

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	48	49	40	57	65	58	49	65	55		
ELL	45	87	88	74	96	100	36				
ASN	94	84		99	90		87	100	86		
BLK	64	59	57	69	63	55	46	82			
HSP	68	63	56	80	77	72	63	88	64		
MUL	87	81		75	66		81	92			
WHT	82	72	57	85	74	70	79	92	80		
FRL	64	55	40	68	64	64	62				

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	43	56	55	56	59	51	38	79			
ELL	50	65	56	64	60	47					
ASN	89	70	55	98	86		84	100	79		

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
BLK	49	49	48	70	56	56	35	90			
HSP	69	61	41	80	63	47	63	93	47		
MUL	81	57	67	83	80	58	75				
WHT	81	69	64	88	75	68	81	95	64		
FRL	57	52	38	74	67	52	51	85	43		

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	71
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	713
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	65
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	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	64
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	76
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 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	72
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	63
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?

The overall ELA Achievement was consistent from the previous year. However, the ELA Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile had a significant decrease in performance. The Math Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest Quartile data are consistent with the previous year's data. The subgroup of ESE as a whole over the years continues to be the lowest.

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

Data trends show that our ESE students consistently score the lowest.

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

New ELA curriculum state-wide standards and new curriculum were contributing factors as well as intentional planning for the students based on their specific needs.

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

The Math overall learning gains as well as the math learning gains of the lowest quartile showed the most gains.

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

Intentional planning as a PLC and ensuring our instruction across a grade level was monitored. The use of our universal FOCUS remediation and enrichment also contributed to the increase in the scores. We also had math tutors supporting for our middle school students.

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

Continue the PLC process with intentional planning and supporting student learning. Identifying the students that struggle and creating a plan that will meet their unique needs. Provide Professional Development for our teachers utilizing our ESE Support Coach and ILC to implement best practices for supporting ESE in general education classes.

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.

Ongoing PD through the PLC process to monitor student learning by discussing student data and best practices to address the unique needs.

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

Continued support of the PLC process with a focus on student data driving the discussions within the PLC process. Continue to use Supplemental Funding for middle school teachers throughout the school year to have content area planning days together to focus on student learning. Continue with our

Wonderful Wednesday for elementary teachers to allow common time to analyze data and plan for instruction.

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.	Lowest Quartile Learning Gains were 46% for the 2022 year and were also 58% for the 2021 year.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The goal is to continue to increase ELA achievement of our lowest quartile by at least 2%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as FAST Progress Monitoring three times a year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Krista Langowski (krista.langowski@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PLC teams planning, teacher lesson plans, common assessment data, FAST data, teacher observation. Use of the SAVAS curriculum resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment and FAST 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.

1. Determine the L25 group at each grade level and identify of this L25 group, which students are ESE
2. PLC monitoring of common formative and summative data
3. Administration observations of instructional practices, including small group.
4. Hire Reading Endorsed teachers for IR middle school classes.

Person Responsible	Jessica McCool (jessica.mccool@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#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.	The Math Lowest Quartile stayed the same from 69% in 2021 to 69% in 2022. We want to show grow in this area.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	LPA will increase math achievement of the lowest quartile by 2%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as FAST Progress Monitoring three times a year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erin Glennon (erin.glennon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will use the PLC process to identify deficits in learning, using high yield instructional strategies in small group to reteach and remediate to achieve skill mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment and FAST 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.

1. Determine the L25 group at each grade level and identify of this L25 group, which students are ESE
2. PLC monitoring of common formative and summative data
3. Administration observations of instructional practices, including small group.

Person Responsible   Erin Glennon (erin.glennon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our SWD in the lowest quartile for ELA dropped from 41% in 2021 to 37% in 2022.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The goal is to increase SWD in the area of ELA achievement of our lowest quartile by at least 2%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as FAST Progress Monitoring three times a year. We will also monitor the Fundations and Voyager ongoing assessments to document student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amber Veniard (amber.veniard@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PLC teams planning, teacher lesson plans, common assessment data, FAST data, teacher observation. Use of the SAVAS curriculum resources. Lesson plans and assessment data from Fundations and Voyagers programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment, Fundations and Voyager data, and FAST 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.

1. Determine the L25 group at each grade level and identify of this L25 group, which students are ESE
2. PLC monitoring of common formative and summative data
3. Administration observations of instructional practices, including small groups.

Person Responsible	Jessica McCool (jessica.mccool@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Due to the increase student enrollment, the social-emotional needs of students is our focus. A positive school culture and environment, as well as a focus on creating positive relationships, reflects a supportive classroom where learning conditions meet the needs of all students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	100% of students referred for mental health, truancy, discipline referrals, and academic concerns will be reviewed by MTSS, and appropriate action taken to address the needs. We will look for a reduction from month to month of the number of students we discuss at our CORE team meeting in the MTSS process.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	During the CORE team meeting in the MTSS process, we will monitor student referrals and update actions taken on a monthly basis. MTSS data will be used to monitor Tier I, II, and III interventions. The MTSS team will monitor mental health referrals, counseling, truancy, grade reports, and discipline referrals. The Early Warning System (EWS) Reports and MTSS database/notes will document progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Krista Langowski (krista.langowski@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Character Counts lessons will be taught by classroom teachers with a focus each month on the character trait of that month. Counselors will continue their small group sessions to address specific groups of students needs. School-wide expectations for following the LPA Way (Learning is our focus, Positive relationships are what we value, Always respectful and responsible).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	On the heals of recovering from a national pandemic, social-emotional lesson through Character Counts are essential to the emotional and academic success of our students.

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.

1. Tier 1 character lessons taught monthly in the classroom
2. MTSS monitoring of students referred for mental health, truancy, and poor grades
3. Mental Health referrals for screening
4. Implementing the LPA Way campus-wide

Person Responsible   Jacqueline Ashcroft (jacqueline.ashcroft@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.

LPA utilizes Capturing Kids' Hearts. Teachers use the EXCEL model to communicate with students and admin use the EXCEL model when communicating with the staff. Each class, KG-8th grade, and the staff has created a social contract, where students and adults hold each other accountable for their behaviors. An environment is created that emphasizes positivity through sharing "good things" and "affirmations". Teachers can't always control what comes into their classrooms. Capturing Kids' Hearts helps teachers create high-achieving classrooms of learning by strengthening students' connections to their peers through enhancing healthy bonds with their teachers and establishing collaborative agreements of acceptable behavior in the classroom.

We have also implemented a school-wide "LPA Way" culture system. "L" stands for Learning is our focus. "P" stands for Positive relationships are what we value. "A" stands for Always respectful and responsible.

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

Liberty Pines Academy teaches the Six Pillars of Character, embedding Character Counts into lessons. LPA continues to teach students the value in goal setting, including self-monitoring toward reaching the goals. The use of Capturing Kids Hearts allows for teachers to use a class created social contracts to teach students how to regulate their own behaviors in the classroom. The annual stakeholder surveys are used to identify successes and areas for improvement. The surveys are shared with all stakeholders as an opportunity to celebrate accomplishments and share a plan of action to address areas for growth. We continue to encourage input, and value the opinions, thoughts and ideas of our stakeholders.