

St. Lucie Public Schools

Windmill Point Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wmp>

Demographics

Principal: Brie Lamb

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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. Lucie 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wmp>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

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.

Windmill Point Elementary promises to nurture a positive school culture and to ensure academic excellence by preparing students for college and career readiness through the fostering of self-confidence, instillation of responsibility, and development of leadership skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Upon entering Windmill Point Elementary, you are met with a warm and inviting environment. When you enter our school, you are welcomed by faculty and staff members. As you walk the halls, you hear the chatter of children excitedly discussing the day's assignments. Glancing around, you notice authentic work that students have chosen to display. It is apparent that students feel secure and comfortable at Windmill Point.

As you continue through Windmill Point, you observe that everyone in the school believes it is important to discover what motivates children. Administration, faculty, and staff work collaboratively to design engaging work for students. Teachers are guided by their grade level scope and sequence and have a clear understanding of what students should know and be able to do. They use data from a variety of assessments, including engagement surveys, to guide instruction for each individual child. Faculty and staff strive to meet high expectations. They are lifelong learners and model this behavior for students. Teachers eagerly implement innovative ideas in their classroom and often share results with colleagues, parents, and community members.

Continuing your journey through our school, you see evidence of parent and community involvement. At Windmill Point Elementary, these citizens serve as partners in educating children. The community volunteers are valuable resources that are utilized to provide rich and authentic learning experiences for children. Administrators, teachers, and staff create opportunities for parental and community involvement to promote student achievement. All of the Windmill Point family is involved in the school decision making process, focusing on every aspect of the child's education.

Windmill Point Elementary is a unique school where everyone works together and supports one another. The ultimate goal is the continuous improvement of students, teachers, staff, and community partners as an integral part of our students' education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lamb, Brie	Principal	
Reals, Leah	Teacher, ESE	
Ackenbrack, Cara-Ann	Instructional Coach	
Time, Marjorie	School Counselor	
Roundtree, Shannon	School Counselor	
Knab, Heather	Instructional Coach	
Brown, Tia	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/13/2018, Brie Lamb

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students

	Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	98	113	131	140	146	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	757
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

Prior Year - 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	126	145	140	157	142	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	874
Attendance below 90 percent	9	17	15	17	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	28	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year - 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	126	145	140	157	142	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	874
Attendance below 90 percent	9	17	15	17	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	28	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	50%	57%	56%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	55%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	53%	42%	56%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	53%	63%	67%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	50%	62%	66%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	51%	62%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	46%	53%	39%	44%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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
03	2019	49%	50%	-1%	58%	-9%
	2018	48%	46%	2%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	49%	50%	-1%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	55%	18%	62%	11%
	2018	55%	54%	1%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	54%	-3%	64%	-13%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	34%	47%	-13%	60%	-26%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	46%	-7%	53%	-14%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	18	48	53	24	48	55	21				
ELL	33	43	62	53	55	60	22				
BLK	47	52	46	46	46	52	30				
HSP	45	46	58	56	51	40	38				
MUL	52	47		54	50						
WHT	51	55	65	54	52	46	50				

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
FRL	47	52	59	52	48	44	36				
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	16	48	47	21	23	13	36				
ELL	28	50	67	40	44	40					
ASN	73			82							
BLK	43	51	71	35	23	14	32				
HSP	46	47	46	53	47	42	58				
MUL	56	31		56	38						
WHT	55	55	59	54	35	30	64				
FRL	46	46	54	46	35	27	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	18	27	23	27	45	41	7				
ELL	30	39	33	49	53	60	4				
BLK	47	54	43	56	60	44	26				
HSP	57	56	43	69	68	80	37				
MUL	67	53		76	73						
WHT	56	54	43	71	67	69	54				
FRL	53	52	42	65	65	63	36				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	53
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	51
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	53
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement. The contributing factor to the low performance was the cohort of students lacked ELA proficiency in 2016-2017 (60% proficient), 2017-2018 (49% proficient), and 2018-2019 (46% proficient).

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement. The contributing factor to the low performance was the cohort of students lacked ELA proficiency in 2016-2017 (60% proficient), 2017-2018 (49% proficient), and 2018-2019 (46% proficient).

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement. The contributing factor to the low performance was the cohort of students lacked ELA proficiency in 2016-2017 (60% proficient), 2017-2018 (49% proficient), and 2018-2019 (46% proficient).

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement is the Math bottom 25% with an increase of 19%. The new actions our school took that attributed to this improvement was departmentalizing grades 3,4,5, math club, additional differentiated instruction, and building capacity through monthly district PD.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

After reflecting on the EWS data, an area concern is the number of students with a level1 on state FSA assessment.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase Science Proficiency
2. Increase Learning Gains
3. Increase Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Learning Gains have been below the district and state percentages over the last two years.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, students will increase Learning Gains rate by 12% earning 63% gains on ELA Learning Gains on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create standards based instruction, review data/quality of instruction, and create differentiated instruction within classrooms for both general education students and ESE students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers (both general education and ESE teachers), create common lesson plans that are standards based, and to close learning gaps based on data for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common grade level CLP times facilitated by academic coaches with ESE support teachers included.
2. Additional CLP time after school and on early release days.
3. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, iReady data, common assessment data, and next steps.
4. Professional development on LLI and Differentiated Instruction
5. Classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Science proficiency declined last year by 12%, lower than both district and state proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2021, students will increase proficiency rate by 14% earning 54% proficiency on Science achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create standards based instruction, review data/quality of instruction, and create differentiated instruction within classrooms for both general education students and ESE students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers (both general and ESE teachers), create common lesson plans that are standards based, and to close learning gaps based on data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common grade level CLP times facilitated by academic coaches with ESE support teachers included.
2. Bi-monthly CLP with district support (Beth Bonvie)
3. Additional CLP time after school and on early release days.
3. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, common assessment data, and next steps.
5. Classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: While students did have an increase in Math Learning Gains, they are at the same percent as district average and below the state average.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, students will increase Learning Gains rate by 11% earning 62% gains on Math Learning Gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create rigorous standards based instruction, review data/quality of instruction, and create differentiated instruction within classrooms for both general education students and ESE students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers (both general education and ESE teachers), create common lesson plans that are standards based meeting the intent and rigor of the standard, and to close learning gaps and/or build foundational skills based on data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common grade level CLP times facilitated by academic coaches with ESE support teachers included.
2. Additional CLP time after school and on early release days.
3. Additional support from district level academic coach (Chris Worley).
4. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, iReady data, common assessment data, and next steps.
5. Classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Windmill Point Elementary will build a positive school culture and environment by including parents, staff, and community members in the decision making and planning process by encouraging open lines of transparent communication and feedback. We will launch our year with each teacher contacting every parent via phone to welcome students back, each teacher will also conduct a virtual "Meet and Greet" via TEAMS, and each family will be provided with a link to a virtual open house can be viewed. Windmill Point Elementary will continue to have SAC (School Advisory Council) and PTO (Parent Teacher Organization) meeting monthly via TEAMS. We will provide meeting information and other parent involvement opportunities within our monthly newsletter and calendar. In addition, we will communicate daily via Student Planners, weekly via Tuesday Folders, and through ongoing use of School Messenger and Skyward.

Assessments and curriculum information will be discussed throughout the year. These times may include student led conferences, School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conferences, IEP meetings, PST meetings, and MTSS meetings. Progress monitoring, data, including, but not limited to FSA, iReady, and district assessments will be shared with parents during SAC meetings and parent conferences.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00