Fort Pierce Westwood Academy The W.E.S.T. PREP Magnet

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy The W.E.S.T. PREP Magnet

1801 PANTHER LN, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	87%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	D	C*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Lucie 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.

Fort Pierce Westwood will become the premier educational center in the county.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fort Pierce Westwood High School utilizes a holistic approach to meeting the individual needs of our students This concept focuses on a student-centered approach to teaching and learning. We are rooted in standards based instruction to promote a conducive environment that uses informed decision-making processes coupled with data to drive the instructional planning to increase student learning. We strive on equipping our students with the skills and intelligence in becoming future contributing members in the community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Lezeau, Joseph	Principal
Armas, Matye	Assistant Principal
Taylor, Leslie	Assistant Principal
Martin, Jason	Assistant Principal
Woltjen, Fred	Assistant Principal
Roy, Matthew	Assistant Principal
Brome , Makeda	Instructional Coach
Peters, Molly	Instructional Coach
Cornett, Julian	Instructional Technology

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Mr. Joseph Lezeau is the Principal of Fort Pierce Westwood HIgh School. He oversees all school operations, monitors his Administrative staff and supervises non-instructional office staff.

Ms. Mayte Armas is one of five Assistant Principals. Her main duties include oversight of the Guidance department and scheduling, MTSS, the 12th grade student body and the Social Studies and Foreign Language departments.

Mrs. Leslie Taylor is one of five Assistant Principals. Her main duties include oversight of our MSAP magnet school grant, the 9th grade student body and the Science department, Leadership techniques and IND teachers.

Mr. Jason Martin is one of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include oversight of Facilities and Activities, Discipline, the 10th grade student body and the CTE and Fine Arts and PE departments.

Mr. Fred Woltjen is one of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include oversight over Testing, Discipline, the 11th grade student body and the Math department.

Mr. Matthew Roy is one of the five Assistant Principals. His main duties include oversight over the Marine Oceanographic Academy (MOA), Professional learning for new and veteran teachers, the 9th grade student body and the ELA Department.

Ms. Makeda Brome is a math coach. Her main duties include coaching teachers on their instructional delivery and pulling small groups for remediation.

Mrs. Molly Peters is an instructional coach focusing on literacy. Her main duties include coaching teachers on their instructional delivery and pulling small groups for remediation.

Mr. Julian Cornett is a technology coach. His main duties include working with teachers on how to effectively embed meaningful technology into their instructional practice.

In keeping with the distributive leadership model at FPWHS, no one administrator is responsible exclusively for instruction. Each Assistant Principal (AP) is responsible for instruction within their assigned team of teachers. Each team consists of approximately 400-450 students and each AP is responsible for administering the principals of instructional leadership to approximately 25-30 teachers & non-instructional support staff members.
AP's meet with teachers to review instructional practices and the alignment of course content and delivery with state standards. Assessment data is also reviewed and plans for targeted and differentiated instructional approaches are discussed. School administrators will participate in each role-alike group's data chats and standards-based lesson planning discussions. SLC meetings focus on improved instructional strategies using the district approved Marzano framework as a model. Principal and AP's visit classrooms frequently to conduct formal and informal observations and provide teachers with relevant, timely feedback.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	164	150	67	505
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	165	127	81	506
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	151	130	67	360
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	175	184	116	679

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	198	170	118	622

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	116	90	54	197	2	1	16	29	30	0	0	1	1	537
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Monday 8/20/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	173	196	175	713
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	119	57	3	330
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	126	109	15	408
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203	187	150	0	540
Retentions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	102	107	96	417

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207	185	148	16	556

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	173	196	175	713
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	119	57	3	330
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	126	109	15	408
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203	187	150	0	540
Retentions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	102	107	96	417

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207	185	148	16	556

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

In comparison to the state, ELA is 18 points,Math is 21 points, and US History is 22 points below the state average.
In comparison to the district, ELA is 12, Math is 10, and US History is 13 below the average.
In comparison to last year, Math performed lowest with Algebra increasing the achievement gap by 20 and Geometry by 12.
US History increased the achievement gap in all subgroups except Hispanics (+4) and White (+16). USH increased the gap between the state average by 2 points.
Our EWS data indicates increase in suspensions in grades 10-12 and the 10th graders had an increase in ELA and Math failures.
Historically we perform below the district and state average in ELA and Math. The last 3 years we have seen a positive trend in closing the achievement gap in ELA. The trend in math is a flucuation from year to year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math showed the greatest decline from 2017-2018. Algebra decreased by 18 and Geometry decreased by 9 points in acheivement. Collectively we had a 14 point decline.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

In comparison to the state, ELA is 18 points,Math is 21 points, and US History is 22 points below the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

In comparison to the state, Biology showed the most improvement in closing the gap from -16 to -8 with an 8 point increase.
Learning gains in ELA closed the gap from -14 to -3, an 11 point improvement. In ELA lowest 25% the gap was narrowed from -15 to -7, an 8 point improvement.
Math showed an increase in learning gains from -10 to -8 and in the lowest 25% from -15 to -8.
Biology showed an increase in closing the gap from the state average by 8 points.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

All tested subjects had high performing teachers strategically placed. There was a laser focus on the collaborative planning process and data chats surrounding our district progress monitoring assessments. Small group instruction and remediation were implemented with fidelity. Collectively as a school we have improved our student tracking and progress monitoring practices to ensure all students are considered in our strategies.

School Data
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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	50%	56%	30%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	52%	53%	36%	45%	46%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	43%	44%	24%	37%	38%
Math Achievement	30%	40%	51%	18%	33%	43%
Math Learning Gains	40%	47%	48%	21%	32%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	41%	45%	31%	36%	38%
Science Achievement	59%	68%	67%	52%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	49%	62%	71%	39%	59%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	124 (169)	164 (173)	150 (196)	67 (175)	505 (713)
One or more suspensions	133 (151)	165 (119)	127 (57)	81 (3)	506 (330)
Course failure in ELA or Math	12 (158)	151 (126)	130 (109)	67 (15)	360 (408)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	204 (203)	175 (187)	184 (150)	116 (0)	679 (540)

Grade Level Data
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
09	2018	37%	52%	-15%	53%	-16%
	2017	30%	51%	-21%	52%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	35%	52%	-17%	53%	-18%
	2017	28%	48%	-20%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	55%	67%	-12%	65%	-10%
2017	46%	64%	-18%	63%	-17%
Compare		9%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	46%	63%	-17%	68%	-22%
2017	47%	61%	-14%	67%	-20%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	23%	54%	-31%	62%	-39%
2017	41%	69%	-28%	60%	-19%
Compare		-18%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	32%	50%	-18%	56%	-24%
2017	41%	60%	-19%	53%	-12%
Compare		-9%			

Subgroup Data

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	26	42	29	21	21		33	28		89	25
ELL	10	43	36	16	77		31	20		75	41
BLK	24	44	41	17	29	22	52	34		91	42
HSP	41	50	27	31	45	65	55	47		85	58
MUL	61	59		47			54			80	
WHT	73	65		77	54		84	85		92	73
FRL	32	46	39	26	35	31	55	39		89	48

	2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	7	25	22	28	50		25	33		74	25
ELL	4	17	21	14	23		18	27		38	
BLK	19	30	28	32	29	23	36	44		79	29
HSP	25	32	18	40	32	21	44	43		80	52
MUL	32	40						50			
WHT	67	54	27	64	43	33	83	69		91	64
FRL	26	34	29	37	29	22	43	45		81	40

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	All teachers will teach to the full intent of the standards within their assigned course.
Rationale	With the 29 new employees we have to Westwood this year, we want to ensure that everyone is teaching to the full intent of the standard, planning with the end in mind and collaboratively planning to reach those goals. ELA standards exist in all curriculum across campus and all teachers are held accountable to those standards. Math standards exist in Science.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcomes for this area of focus include Increased student achievement in GPA, unit assessments, Acceleration, and FSA and EOCs leading to an increase in the graduation rate. Another intended outcome is a 14% increase in ELA proficiency and a 15% increase in Math proficiency over last year.
Point Person	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Action Step	
Description	Collaborative planning will be attended regularly by Administration to offer support and resources as well as scrutinizing lesson plans and their delivery for the purposes of continued improvement in teacher instructional practice. ELA action steps include ACES and FLEE map writing strategies continue to be implemented across curriculum with an improved cold writes schedule in place to have four opportunities to write and get feedback. Continuous attention to data chats with an addition to student data tracking practices. Reading across the curriculum will be enhanced through lesson planning protocols. Teachers will do peer observations for the purposes of analyzing student tasks. Reciprocal teaching will be introduced this year. All efforts will be supported across the campus as school wide initiatives in all subject areas. Math action steps include APES writing strategy, enhancement in usage of graphic organizers, emphasis on terminology and the implementation of quarterly teacher bootcamps, which is a district initiatives we will be employing on campus. All efforts will be supported across the science classes as well as anywhere else there is a standards alignment. US History and Biology teachers will be collaborating with Reading teachers to embed their content into the Reading practice to directly impact their content EOC exam. Content teachers will embed those same reading strategies in their courses to support ELA. Cross curricular planning will be implemented and include Administration, Literacy coach as well as content teachers of Reading, Biology and US History.
Person Responsible	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monitoring of gradebooks, unit assessment data, data chats and lesson plan uploads.
Person Responsible	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Activity #2	
Title	Reduce the amount of office referrals due to disruptive behavior that leads to lack of instructional time
Rationale	Early warning system data shows that 53.7% (954/1777) of all discipline referrals in 2017-218 school year were due to classroom disruptions. BIR data for 2017-2018 school year pertaining to disruption of instructional time was 84.7% (1494/1763) Instructional time is protected and students who disrupt the learning environment are then losing their own instructional time. This directly impacts our school's proficiency in content areas but also the graduation rate.
Intended Outcome	Reduce student disruption to instruction resulting in discipline referrals by 15%.
Point Person	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)
Action Step	
Description	Teachers create a classroom management plan, teach it to their students and enforce it regularly. PBIS incentives for students behaving aligned to ROARS expectations. Posters of CHAMPS for hallway transitions are hung in halls. Teachers post their CHAMPS expectations in all classrooms. An additional Dean on campus will focus on prevention rather than reactive practices. Guidance and Deans have straight alpha student lists so they loop with the students for all four years. Training will be given to the teachers on equity, empathy and cultural competence in hopes of developing a better understanding of our student body. Monthly Leader in Me classes will be facilitated by teachers and topics are focused on Social and Emotional Learning. Student climate surveys will be given as baseline data and will be done again mid year and at the end of the year.
Person Responsible	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Data will be analyzed regularly by Administration and Deans from Skyward and/ or Power Bi.
Person Responsible	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Fort Pierce Westwood plans on utilizing multiple facets of mass communication through SLPS's school messenger, Skyward Parent Portal, and our school's social media outlets to increase positive relationships with all stakeholders. Increasing our forms of communication fosters a level of transparency to parents, families, community members that need to be informed about our school. In addition, all

stakeholders are invited to partake in our School Advisory Council, as this group's primary function is to evaluate and advise on the progression of the School Improvement Plan.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Personnel identified to assist students in times of crisis include school counselors, school social worker, school psychologist, school resource officers, school nurse, school behavior specialist and any other trained individual.

The Freshmen Leadership class is an essential component of our ninth grade academy. Strong emphasis is on self-awareness and career exploration. A major objective of the Freshmen Seminar class is for students to identify a purpose and focus for their studies toward senior project and graduation. The class teaches study skills, goal setting, and organizational skills required for successful transition to high school and beyond. The technology coach teaches digital citizenship through the Freshmen Seminar classes.

Students identified as needing additional support are placed with mentors and specific interventions become a part of their daily practice, example of Check In Check Out.

At risk students are mentored through Operation Graduation.
Students with frequent behavior infractions are monitored and mentored through the Deans' offices. Check In/Check Out mentoring is in place for ESE and non-ESE students who will benefit from the process.

Monthly advisory periods called "Leader in Me" will consist of teachers facilitatitng an activity around SEL issues our students face. These monthly activities fall under Mind/Body awareness, Physical/digital citizenship, work ethic, self-advocacy and relience/adversity.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

We support all freshmen with our Leadership course, where they learn about all of their high school graduation requirements, study skills, and available courses within the various SLC's we have to offer.

Highlights include:
A resource teacher, a guidance counselor, dean, and an administrator who collaborate and share responsibility for success. All guidance, Deans and ESE supports have alphabetical splits for their caseloads so they can loop with their students for four years to promote better relationships.
A pyramid of interventions including parent involvement, support services, and after-school tutoring
Team Time (Academic Intervention)
Senior Mentoring
Required Freshmen Seminar Class
Student led conferences provide a structure whereby students describe their own academic progress and performance to their parents
The Freshmen Leadership class is an essential component of our ninth grade academy. Strong emphasis is on self-awareness and career exploration. A major objective of the Freshmen Leadership class is for students to identify a purpose and focus for their studies toward senior project and graduation. The class teaches study skills, goal setting, and organizational skills required for successful transition to high school and beyond.

Outgoing cohorts meet with their individual counselor(s) to review credits, GPA and post-secondary options. We offer various college rep visits as well as tech schools and the military branches to promote post-secondary opportunities. Through our guidance department and our graduation coach, we assist our students with paperwork and procedures to ensure a smooth and successful transition. All guidance, Deans and ESE supports have alphabetical splits for their caseloads so they can loop with their students for four years to promote better assessment of student needs for post-secondary experiences.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

There are several entities that are responsible for making decisions regarding student achievement and the best use of school funds. The School Advisory council that is responsible for determining the use of SAC funds uses school data to determine the best use of those funds.

The school leadership team made up of Administration, Literacy and Math (Instructional), and Technology coaches, Exceptional Student Education specialists, Graduation Coach and teacher leaders are charged with the task of ensuring that teachers are participating in quality collaborative planning that leads to quality instruction that promotes student engagement in high quality work. Discussions about the Florida standards, the scope of the standards, and the Framework for Quality Instruction are necessary to ensure that teachers are clear about the expectations from the state, the district and the school. Collaborative planning sessions are scheduled weekly for common course planning.

Department meetings take place monthly, Roll a like collaborative planning by subject area meets once a week during 90 minute block, Administrators meet weekly, and Faculty Council meetings occur monthly.. In addition there is a new educator support meeting monthly through the district and additional monthly support through the school monthly.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Interested students will have the opportunity to meet with visiting college representatives as well as go on college tours.
The master schedule offers more advanced placement and dual enrollment courses on our two campuses. The Marine and Oceanographic campus offers the majority of our honors level, AP and dual enrollment courses.
AP courses offered include:
AP Literature, AP Composition, AP Environmental Science, AP Biology, AP US History, and AP World History.
Certifications exist for the following courses:
Agritechnology, Veterinary Assisting, Allied Health, Criminal Justice, Personal Trainer, Culinary, Robotics, Exercise Science, Medical Management, Pharmacy Tech, Digital Design, and Microsoft Academy.

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$0.00**