

St. Lucie Public Schools

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



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

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/>

Demographics

Principal: David Alfonso

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	79%
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 (45%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (36%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lezeau, Joseph	Principal	Mr. Joseph Lezeau is the Principal of Fort Pierce Westwood Academy. He oversees all school operations, monitors his Administrative staff, and supervises non-instructional office staff.
Taylor, Leslie	Assistant Principal	is one of five Assistant Principals. Her main duties include oversight of our MSAP magnet school grant, the 12th grade student body, the Science department, Science CTE and IND teachers.
Martin, Jason	Assistant Principal	Mr. Jason Martin is one of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include oversight over the Marine Oceanographic Academy (MOA), JROTC and AgriScience, and the MOA student body.
Woltjen, Fred	Assistant Principal	Mr. Fred Woltjen is one of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include oversight of the Guidance department and scheduling, 11th-grade student body, and the Social Studies and Foreign Language departments. He also oversees the Technology coach and Technology CTE teachers.
Roy, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Mr. Roy is one of the five Assistant Principals. His main duties include oversight over Professional learning for new teachers, Student Services, the 9th-grade student body, and the ELA Department.
Brome, Makeda	Assistant Principal	Ms. Brome is one of five Assistant Principals. Her main duties include oversight of Facilities and Activities, Discipline, Criminal Justice and Culinary, the 10th-grade student body, and the Math department.
Power, Jacob	Instructional Coach	
Rivera, Jesus	Other	Teacher on Special Assignment working with teachers and students academically.
Cornett, Julian	Dean	
Bailey, Lisa	Other	Graduation Coach
Ford, Kendra	Other	MTSS Coordinator
Miller, Monica	School Counselor	Guidance Chair

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Parks, Kerry	Dean	
Reese, Patricia	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, David Alfonso

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

79

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	79%
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 (45%) 2017-18: C (48%)

	2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (36%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588	521	482	353	1944
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209	198	223	191	821
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	129	126	77	442
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	90	8	146
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	42	23	18	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	134	148	119	586
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	149	41	124	488

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	211	191	183	168	753

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	23	22	21	83

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545	422	396	336	1699
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	102	149	144	520
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	171	144	124	589
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	54	15	83
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209	208	205	190	812

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	140	146	172	152	610

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	8	7	5	38

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545	422	396	336	1699
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	102	149	144	520
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	171	144	124	589
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	54	15	83
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209	208	205	190	812

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	140	146	172	152	610

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	8	7	5	38

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	41%	51%	56%	31%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	39%	48%	51%	35%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	36%	42%	26%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	27%	40%	51%	44%	56%	49%
Math Learning Gains	26%	41%	48%	34%	44%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	38%	45%	24%	36%	39%
Science Achievement	63%	71%	68%	49%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	52%	68%	73%	50%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	41%	54%	-13%	55%	-14%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	36%	51%	-15%	53%	-17%
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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
2019	60%	71%	-11%	67%	-7%
2018	55%	67%	-12%	65%	-10%
Compare		5%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	68%	-19%	70%	-21%
2018	46%	63%	-17%	68%	-22%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	16%	51%	-35%	61%	-45%
2018	23%	54%	-31%	62%	-39%
Compare		-7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	55%	-23%	57%	-25%
2018	32%	50%	-18%	56%	-24%
Compare		0%			

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	12	19	13	19	26	27	33	38		86	40
ELL	9	25	26	12	18	17	33	15		85	62
BLK	25	29	21	16	19	20	47	40		91	59
HSP	47	46	16	29	30	30	64	53		89	66
MUL	67	50		25	8		83	50		100	73
WHT	73	55		62	43		93	86		96	84
FRL	30	31	22	23	26	22	52	45		93	65
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

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	57
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	
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	74
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy scored the lowest in ELA Bottom 25%. Contributing factors include a high percentage of students arriving as 9th graders as Level 1s coupled with educators new to the field and new to our population challenges that required extensive professional development in standards based instruction and discipline practices. An additional contributor is the placement of a long term substitute occupies a critical line in our master schedule. While the educator is coachable and reliable, formalized training is lacking.

One significant trend in improving our contributing factors is that teachers on our campus, particularly our ELA teachers, receive extensive professional development around standards and their instructional practice. This continued focus on improving student achievement through empowering our educators is the necessary trend on campus each year to service our large number of low performers (~70%).

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

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy saw the greatest decline in our ELA Bottom 25% population. The contributing factors were stated above.

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.

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy Math achievement is 24 points behind the state average, making it the largest gap. One contributing factor is similar to the ELA Bottom 25% wherein we have a high percentage of low math achievers coming in as 9th graders and the lift requires skilled and consistent educators in place. One prominent contributing factor is the lack of consistency in the educator who teaches the courses. There has been significant turnover in our teaching staff and we have adapted

by moving teachers into other courses to have a highly effective educator in the state tested courses. This has been an ongoing trend until this year where we have a consistent team in place for the second year in a row.

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

Biology had a 4% increase in student achievement for school grade and a 5% increase when including all students (not for school grade data).

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.

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

Based on EWS data, our areas of concern are Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. Both are at 31% which is below the Federal Index of 41%. Another area of concern is Black/African American students, which are at 38%, 3% below the Federal Index of 41%.

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

1. Social Emotional Learning
2. Standards Based Instruction
3. Academic Performance of ELL, SWD, ED, and Black/African American Students
4. Decrease Early Warning Systems Data
5. Recruitment and Retention of Highly Effective Teachers

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: With the 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.

Measurable 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 5% increase in ELA proficiency and 5% increase in Math proficiency compared to the last year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: As an evidence-based strategy to achieve this goal, we will be using performance scales to break standards into digestible learning targets based on declarative and procedural knowledge, as outlined by Moore, Garst, and Marzano (2015). For ELL students, we are strategically scheduling students in English through ESOL and Developmental Language courses. SWD have been scheduled into sections that can best support their needs with support facilitation and teachers that have evidence of high impact. We will provide teachers with trainings on implicit bias and cultural awareness for Economically Disadvantaged students and Black/African American Students. We will provide small group instruction for all subgroups through core classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The scales allow students to see all of the smaller skills associated with a larger standard learning goal. In addition, planning with performance scales allows teachers to see learning whole-to-part and requires that teachers sequence and chunk learning in a student-friendly way. The performance scales also helps teachers unpack standards into manageable teaching bites, which allows teachers to create targeted formative assessments to measure very specific learning gains toward a specific learning target (Moore, Garst, and Marzano (2015).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use collaborative planning to review performance scales with teachers.
2. Lead PD to unpack standards into declarative and procedural knowledge.
3. Use collaborative planning to develop formative assessments aligned to specific targets on performance scales.
4. Provide PD on Florida Students.Org, so teachers can watch videos and engage in conversations around the true intent of the standards.
5. Instructional coaches model how to use performance scales with students in a classroom setting.

Person Responsible Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: For the 2018-2019 school year, 41% (838/2049) of the referrals had to do with open defiance of authority or disruptive conduct, which are behaviors that threaten the orderly operation of a school campus.

Measurable Outcome: Our school conducted a SEL Climate survey during the 2019-2020 school year. The results of that survey showed that 37% of students felt a sense belonging, 46% were able to effectively regulate their emotions, and 43% felt that there was a positive school environment. By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, we would like the results of the survey to increase to at least 41% for Sense of belonging, 51% for Emotional Regulation, and 47% for School Climate. Additionally we would like for school referrals for open defiance to be decreased by 10%

The teacher climate survey showed that 51% have a positive SEL Well being, we would like that to increase to 64%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The SLPS and FPWA SEL Plan will be implemented daily throughout the 2020-2021 school year. Each month there will be a SEL Theme, National Theme of the Month, PBIS Theme, Magnet Them, and focus on one of the Habits of Highly Effective People. Additionally, the school will be using Franklin-Covey's Leader in me curriculum. 9th Grade will use the 7 Habits Curriculum and 10th-12th Grade will use Find your Voice Career Readiness Curriculum. Staff will receive additional support to support their emotional well being with training on Compassion Fatigue, Equity and Trauma Informed Care. In addition we are using community circles to facilitate student discourse around important topics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We chose the Leader in Me framework because it focuses on helping students develop the 7 Habits of highly effective people, published by Stephen Covey. Leader in Me has potential to improve student behavior by 22.84%. In addition, there's opportunity for teens who are leaders to improve mental healthy by 28%. (Leader In Me.org, 2018). This strategy will be used to address all subgroups (ED, ELL, Black/African American, and SWD), which will empower students to become leaders on campus and in their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a student lead team.
2. Develop an adult lead team.
3. Train the faculty on the 7 habits.
4. Deliver daily lessons on social and emotional learning to students.
5. Embed 7 Habits across the curriculum through portfolios.

Person Responsible Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The other priorities include: Academic Performance of SWD, ELL, ED, and Black/African American students, Decrease Early Warning Systems Data, and Recruitment and Retention of Highly Effective Teachers. Each of these three areas fall under the umbrella of Standards Aligned Instruction and Social Emotional Learning. Improvements in Standards Aligned Instruction and Social Emotional Learning will result in an improvement of the Academic Performance of SWD, ELL, and Black/African American students. Additionally, a focus on adult Social Emotional Learning will result in the retention and recruitment of Highly Effective Teachers.

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.

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. Student families attend our School Advisory Council monthly meetings and offer input in the decision-making process. Home visits occur as an intervention to academics or behavior but they have proven to strengthen the relationship with our families and promote parent involvement.

In addition, we are using Panorama survey results to gauge where improvements to school culture need to be made. From the results of the survey we are engaging the staff in schoolwide training on Equity, Implicit Bias, Social Emotional Learning, and Franklin-Covey's Leader in Me curriculum. We will engage parents and community members through the 7 Habits of Highly Effective Families.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00