Liberty Pines Academy

2021-22 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: 8/25/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2020-21: (76%) 2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* 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.](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.

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.

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
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hemingway, Traci	Principal	
McCool, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Thompson, Terri	Instructional Coach	
Ryan, Sherry	Teacher, K-12	
Raya, Staci	Teacher, K-12	
Hoelle, Diana	Teacher, K-12	
Thomson, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Carroll, Necia	Teacher, K-12	
Frank, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Veniard, Amber	Teacher, ESE	
Cox, Kelley	Guidance Counselor	
Ferrara, Jason	Teacher, K-12	
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
Wednesday 8/25/2021, Donny Hoessler

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

112

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,449

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

15

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

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	147	139	158	155	158	167	182	183	218	0	0	0	0	1507
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	2	1	3	2	6	3	14	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	3	10	11	4	10	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	3	1	1	1	0	4	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	10	4	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	3	7	1	7	5	10	5	10	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	3	5	0	2	8	12	3	12	0	0	0	0	45

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	5	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	23

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	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	147	139	158	155	158	167	182	183	218	0	0	0	0	1507
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	2	1	3	2	6	3	14	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	3	10	11	4	10	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	3	1	1	1	0	4	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	10	4	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	3	7	1	7	5	10	5	10	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	3	5	0	2	8	12	3	12	0	0	0	0	45

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	5	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	23

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	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	81%			79%	84%	61%	80%	72%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	71%			66%	67%	59%	63%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%			58%	61%	54%	53%	62%	52%
Math Achievement	84%			87%	88%	62%	87%	76%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%			74%	71%	59%	72%	65%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%			64%	66%	52%	65%	68%	52%
Science Achievement	76%			77%	77%	56%	78%	73%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	91%			94%	95%	78%	95%	85%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	77%	78%	-1%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	76%	3%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2021					
	2019	78%	74%	4%	54%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
07	2021					
	2019	72%	72%	0%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
08	2021					
	2019	84%	71%	13%	56%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	86%	82%	4%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	89%	82%	7%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	80%	-6%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
06	2021					
	2019	87%	74%	13%	55%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
07	2021					
	2019	85%	80%	5%	54%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
08	2021					
	2019	90%	78%	12%	46%	44%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	68%	73%	-5%	53%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	84%	72%	12%	48%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	90%	4%	71%	23%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	79%	18%	61%	36%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready data.
Fall = percent of students Early on Grade Level or above.
Winter = percent of students Mid On Grade Level or above.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	46	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14	19	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	33	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55	54	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32	37	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73	59	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	38	32	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	30	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	24	18	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63	49	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	24	12	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49	31	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	36	16	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	31	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	30	9	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62	31	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	39	22	
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	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					

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
ASN	89	70	55	98	86		84	100	79		
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		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	40	51	38	50	55	44	44	73			
ELL	60	67	71	80	80						
ASN	91	75		97	81		89	95	88		
BLK	60	54	43	68	59	38	65				
HSP	76	66	68	84	80	79	69	85	40		
MUL	70	54	50	78	68	50	50				
WHT	81	62	54	88	71	65	81	96	53		
FRL	70	59	60	80	62	55	60	86	63		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	751
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	74
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	62
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	70
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	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	77
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

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

ELA Lowest quartile learning gains and math lowest quartile learning gains is stagnate. The subgroup of ESE as a whole over the years continues to be the lowest.

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

Data consistently 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?

COVID, Distance Learning, and Quarantining were contributing factors to lower scores. Intentional planning for the students based on their specific needs.

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

ELA Achievement overall.

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 score.

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.

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.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lowest Quartile Learning Gains were 58% for the 2021 year and were also 58% for the 2019 year.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to continue to increase ELA learning gains of our lowest quartile by at least 2%.
Monitoring:	Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as iReady diagnostic three times a year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terri Thompson (terri.thompson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC teams planning, teacher lesson plans, common assessment data, iReady data, teacher observation. Use of the SAVAS curriculum resources. Offer after school tutoring to our struggling students in K-5 4 days a week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment and iReady data.

Action Steps to Implement

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. Identify students for the after school tutoring
4. Hire reading endorsed teachers for the tutoring
5. Administration observations of instructional practices, including small group

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Math Lowest Quartile grew from 64% in 2019 to 69% in 2021. We want to keep the momentum going.
Measurable Outcome:	LPA will increase math achievement of the lowest quartile by 2%.
Monitoring:	Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as iReady diagnostic three times a year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica McCool (jessica.mccool@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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:	PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment and iReady data.

Action Steps to Implement

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to COVID, Distance Learning, and students on Quarantine, the social-emotional needs of students is our focus. A positive school culture and environment reflects a supportive classroom where learning conditions meet the needs of all students.
Measurable 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:	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:	Jessica McCool (jessica.mccool@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The impact of social distancing is already making headlines all over the nation. The Florida Department of Education recommends schools prepare additional resources for addressing the needs of the students due to social isolation, fears associated with a pandemic, and mobility restrictions within the community and country.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our SWD in the lowest quartile for ELA dropped from 55% in 2019 to 41% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase SWD in the area of ELA learning gains of our lowest quartile by at least 2%.
Monitoring:	Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as iReady diagnostic 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:	PLC teams planning, teacher lesson plans, common assessment data, iReady data, teacher observation. Use of the SAVAS curriculum resources. Lesson plans and assessment data from Fundations and Voyagers programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment, Fundations and Voyager data, and iReady data.

Action Steps to Implement

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	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When compared to all combination schools statewide, our school falls into the low category. Our total suspensions were in the middle range. we ranked #6 out of 66 schools in the state in this category. All other categories were in the low range. We will make an effort through our Capturing Kids Hearts program to see a decrease in the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions. We are implementing a Lead Worthy class in our middle school to help develop student leaders. We are also working with our Student Council to create monthly videos that will focus on character education and how students can make it a good day or not. The choice is theirs to make. We will continue to monitor student behavior though the CORE portion of our MTSS meetings to identify areas of need. We will utilize our social worker, mental health counselor, and school counselors to meet with students on a regular basis as a proactive approach to discipline.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

LPA utilizes Capturing Kids Hearts. Teachers use the EXCEL model to communicate with students. Each class, K-8, has created a social contract, where students hold each other accountable for their own behavior in each classroom. An environment is created that emphasizes positivity through "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.

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

Liberty Pines teaches the 6 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 contract 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.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00