Port St. Lucie High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Port St. Lucie High School

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Tel ESE   Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	70%
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	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: 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	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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

Port St. Lucie High School

1201 SE JAGUAR LN, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

The mission of Port St. Lucie High School is to ensure all students feel safe and cared for, equipped with the knowledge, skills, and desire to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Port St. Lucie High School, in partnership with parents and community, will become a premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. Our name will be synonymous with the continuous improvement of student achievement and the success of each individual. Our promise is to move from good to great focusing on the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for each child, every day.

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
Wigginton, Brooke	Principal	School-wide operations, Single School Culture, Dual Enrollment, Math and School Counseling Departments, Algebra and Geometry EOC
Earley, Gerald	Assistant Principal	Senior Class, School Safety, Advanced Coursework (AICE, AP & IB) Upper School English, Transportation, Technology and Graduation.
Belgraves, Myrna	Assistant Principal	Junior Class, School Improvement Plan, Career and Technical Education, World Languages and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Departments, FSAA and Acceleration.
Saget, Louisa	Assistant Principal	Freshman Class, Positive Behavior Support (PBIS) Master Schedule, Social Emotional Learning (SEL), English & Reading Departments and Title 1.
Lee, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Sophomore Class, Attendance, New Teachers (NEST), Testing, School Advisory Council (SAC) and Visual Performing Arts & Science Departments.
Powers, Suzanne	Dean	9th & 11th Grade Discipline, Attendance, C2G, & Peer Mediation
Rodriguez, Kareem	Dean	10th & 12th Grade Discipline, Attendance, Transportation, Title IX, Peer Mediation

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/28/2021, Nicole Tel ESE

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

80

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,751

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

11

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

11

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	441	467	418	425	1751
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	173	178	114	618
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	41	8	5	102
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	138	135	78	469
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	157	121	66	455
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	103	82	21	336
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	114	95	2	299
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	53	41	11	170

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	226	223	197	92	738

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	4	4	2	9	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436	422	438	404	1700
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	124	145	151	538
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	58	41	23	186
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	40	0	39	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	45	16	44	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	95	103	71	367
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	81	35	81	285

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	116	125	93	113	447

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	1	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436	422	438	404	1700
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	124	145	151	538
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	58	41	23	186
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	40	0	39	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	45	16	44	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	95	103	71	367
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	81	35	81	285

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	116	125	93	113	447

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	1	1
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				53%	51%	56%	50%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	48%	51%	49%	52%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	36%	42%	38%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				49%	40%	51%	38%	40%	51%
Math Learning Gains				37%	41%	48%	46%	47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	38%	45%	39%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				79%	71%	68%	75%	68%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				67%	68%	73%	62%	62%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	55%	51%	4%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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
2021					
2019	76%	71%	5%	67%	9%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	68%	-3%	70%	-5%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	30%	51%	-21%	61%	-31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	55%	4%	57%	2%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA, Math, Biology, and US History Unit Assessment Data was used to determine proficiency.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41%	44%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	37%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	17%	10%
	English Language Learners	9%	8%	7%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1%	1%	1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	1%	1%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	69%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	54%	67%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	41%	16%
	English Language Learners	28%	40%	16%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	4%	4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	3%	2%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	2%	2%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	3%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60%	51%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	48%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	39%	27%	36%
	English Language Learners	35%	31%	49%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
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			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	40%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	31%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	30%	41%
	English Language Learners	19%	38%	30%

Grade 12				
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			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	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	17	39	34	15	23	20	27	27		91	52
ELL	20	32	42	12	30	35	50	42		100	87
ASN	50			50				70			
BLK	38	33	17	16	23	22	49	49		99	81
HSP	41	42	37	16	26	25	60	51		97	81

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
MUL	55	46		36	19		68	47		94	94
WHT	48	46	39	25	18	15	63	65		96	85
FRL	39	38	29	17	21	22	55	50		96	82

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	26	29	20	35	30	25	44	44		98	49
ELL	35	38	32	67	30		65			85	88
ASN	85	70								90	
BLK	43	44	43	40	42	37	63	57		96	82
HSP	49	48	35	50	35	27	80	64		96	90
MUL	56	44		35	13		86			95	79
WHT	58	50	32	52	40	48	86	72		99	80
FRL	49	48	36	45	37	31	75	65		97	81

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	28	33	20	23	57		48	33		82	48
ELL	23	41	53	21	31		60	35		53	60
ASN	63	69		55			82	67		92	83
BLK	48	52	43	38	49	48	76	58		88	58
HSP	42	46	38	33	35	16	73	57		91	62
MUL	61	47		50	60		80	73		93	36
WHT	54	49	32	40	50	42	74	67		89	66
FRL	44	46	37	36	47	43	75	58		86	61

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	57
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 – Port St. Lucie High School remains consistent based on the ELA FSA scores and is on par with both the State and District just shy of a few percentage points with achievement and learning gains between 2018 and 2019. Although the 9th grade ELA scores indicate a 7% decrease between the school and district, while the 10th-grade scores showed a gain of 4%. However, during the 2020-2021 school year using the progress monitoring data students showed 41% proficiency in the Fall, 44% in the Winter, and 34% in the Spring.
Overall when evaluating the progress monitoring data Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners demonstrate very low proficiency and need remediation along with additional supports. Further, the progress monitoring data across all areas during the 2020-2021 school year was significantly lower than the EOC scores except in Biology. In both the Fall & Spring 60% of students showed proficiency compared with the 76% on the EOC's. While U.S. History showed 65% proficiency in 2019 and 34% in the Fall, 40% in the Winter, and 60% in the Spring recovering some of the lost ground.

Algebra 1 EOC was abysmal dropping 29% proficiency from 30% in 2019 to only 1% proficiency in Fall, Winter & Spring of 2020-2021. In 2019 Geometry was 59% proficiency while progress monitoring in 2020-2021 indicated that proficiency was 11% in the Fall and 4% in both Winter and Spring.

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

Based on the progress monitoring tools employed during the 2020-2021 school year only 1% of Algebra 1 students showed proficiency during the Fall, Winter, and Spring. Unfortunately, both English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not show any proficiency with Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students showed 1% proficiency during the Winter and Spring and 0% in the Fall indicating a great need for improvement.
When analyzing Algebra 1 EOC scores from 2019 comparing the proficiency of the State's 61% and the District's 51%, there is a deficiency of 31% and 20% respectively.

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

In 2019 a full-time math coach was not employed, which impacted the ability to push in and pull out to provide support. Additionally, Collaborative Planning (CLP) was not established with fidelity and Teachers did not collaborate on assignments. Although there was a focus on Achievement Level Descriptors (ALD's), actual emphasis was missing on the tasks and checks for understanding to be completed.

New this year, a Math Interventionalist was hired to work with Tier 2 students. She will work on 90 targeted students who have not met the math requirement for graduation. She will also pull out students to provide more targeted instruction and offer tutoring and additional support such as pushing into classrooms as needed.

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

Biology EOC had the greatest improvement as Port St. Lucie High showed an increase of 5% between the school and district and an increase of 9% points between the school and the State. Progress monitoring data indicates that between the Fall & Spring students maintained 60% proficiency with a slight dip in the Winter at 51% proficiency.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement were the strong Collaborative Learning and Planning Team(CLP's) that was established who met regularly and ensured that their curriculum was being implemented with fidelity. Additionally, teachers created an incentive system that captured students' attention and motivated them to keep learning along with providing intensive remediation.

New this year, teachers will focus on reading strategies as the data indicates that students have low ELA scores and need support with supporting evidence along with organizing their thoughts. Teachers will also continue the work on remediation utilizing the unit assessments and other data sources.

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

Remediation and reteaching is key along with reviewing the data from unit assessments to make informed decisions on the next steps. Implementing checks for understanding and building trust will also be beneficial in engaging the whole child in the learning process.

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.

District and school-wide professional development was offered during the preplanning week and will continue during the year focused on high effect size strategies along with practices that will increase engagement and support academic growth.

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

- Math Interventionalist
- After School Tutoring
- Push-In and Pull Out Supports
- Reading Coach to assist teachers with planning and implementation
- Collaborative Planning Teams led by Administration
- Social-Emotional Learning – Specifically through PBIS and incorporating incentives and rewards

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Panorama- Results from the Spring 2021 survey indicated a decrease in student supports with the largest decreases in School Climate (-4) and Rigorous Expectations (-5). Student results showed an increase in Emotional Regulation (+1) and a decrease in Social Awareness (-1). Teacher Climate Survey- Results from our teacher climate survey showed a significant decrease in the following area: School Leadership consistently enforces rules for student conduct. Discipline - Analysis of Power BI data from 2020-21 school year shows the number of Other Discipline Referrals (ODR)s reported by incident has decreased. However, level 1 offenses (Tardies, Dress code) are still a concern. Attendance- Analysis of Power BI data from the 2020-21 school year shows that students who attended school virtually had lower daily attendance. Area of Concern:10th grade students. As a result, we have identified the following areas of concern: School Climate, Teacher-Student relationships.
Measurable Outcome:	2021-2022- Goals In the area of School Climate, Port St Lucie High school plans to make a 4 point increase from spring 2021 to spring 2020. In the area of Rigorous Expectations, Port St Lucie High School plans to make a 7 point increase from spring 2021 to spring 2022 In the area of Social Awareness Port St Lucie High School plans to make a 4 point increase from spring 2021 to spring 2022
Monitoring:	An SEL monitoring Checklist will be utilized to determine the effectiveness of implementation. Department chairs will monitor lesson plans to ensure that SEL explicit instruction is being taught daily. Panorama Survey will be given twice a year to determine the effectiveness of the SEL plan. Further, the administration will continue to monitor school-wide for fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To establish a student-centered classroom that fosters a sense of community, each classroom will implement the following SEL evidence-based strategies 1. Establish Shared Agreements/ Harmony Goals 2. Cooperative Learning 3. Circles 4. SEL Adapted Curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-	Explicit SEL Instruction will build the foundational skills that will support our students ability to make responsible decisions. Shared agreement and harmony goals will create a school environment that fosters a sense of community among the students and staff. Ultimately,

based Strategy:	these measurable strategies will ensure that each of our students and faculty members feel connected and supported.

Action Steps to Implement

Faculty and Staff training, Administration and Department Chair continue to monitor to ensure fidelity of implementation.

Person Responsible   Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)

PBIS Team - Meet monthly to review the data and establish incentives to foster connectivity

Person Responsible   Suzanne Powers (suzanne.powers@stlucieschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities Sub Group Data - Data indicates that students with disabilities are not performing at the same level as their peers. In fact, they are in danger of failing more than their peers and are currently below the federal index of 41% (Presently 40%).
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities will no longer be an area of concern for the ESSA data and will meet the federal guidelines performing above 41%. Specifically, the number of students with disabilities demonstrating learning gains in ELA & Math will increase by 10%.
Monitoring:	The ESE Specialists will meet weekly with the Assistant Principal to review the data as it relates to ESE students and provide support to teachers to meet the individual needs of ESE students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Myrna Belgraves (myrna.tamar-belgraves@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Collaborative Planning (Considered an effective strategy for SWD) 2. Effective monitoring 3. Strict adherence to student IEP's and 504's 4. Support Teachers monitoring for students with D's & F's and contact families to coordinate support
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through the targeted placement of support teachers in classrooms, students can benefit from more one on one instruction, thus improving their performance. Additionally, with the implementation of school-wide collaborative planning teachers can effectively plan standards-based lessons thus creating instructional goals and materials that can be customized and adjusted for each individual.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify and train all staff on the role of classroom support teachers along with monitor the contact of support teachers with their students.

Person Responsible Mario Aleus (mario.aleus@stlucieschools.org)

Train the staff on ESE procedures and ensure that all teachers are taught how to access students Individual Education Plans (IEP)'s and that they are being utilized effectively to meet the needs of students.

Person Responsible Myrna Belgraves (myrna.tamar-belgraves@stlucieschools.org)

Regularly check grades and attendance to monitor students progress towards learning targets and follow up with case managers to ensure that students needs are being met.

Person Responsible Myrna Belgraves (myrna.tamar-belgraves@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Learning Gains & Achievement - Math learning gains showed the lowest performance with a 9% drop to 37% from 2018's 46%. Historically, the school has fallen behind the district and state in math learning gains. Although, two years prior there was a significant gap between the state and the school. Specifically, an 11% difference, indicating that more targeted intervention is needed as well as a focus on standards-based instruction, monitoring, and interventions for our at-risk students. Although math proficiency improved, there is still progress to be made.
Measurable Outcome:	An increase of 11% is needed in math learning gains to meet the state's average. In addition, the goal is to increase math proficiency by 5%. Teachers will participate in 120 minutes of Collaborative Planning weekly. Teachers will analyze student work samples, and plan target based lessons.
Monitoring:	Unit Assessments will be conducted at the end of each unit to assess student growth on identified standards. Math Nation will be utilized to track student performance weekly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brooke Wigginton (brooke.wigginton@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through collaborative planning, teachers will identify research-based interventions to increase student achievement towards targetted standards.Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted by the administration and the math coach to assess the fidelity of classroom instruction. Data will be monitored by administration and the math coach to be used for planning and remediation. Afterschool boot camps, pull-outs, push-ins and tutoring opportunities will be made available.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through collaborative planning teachers and administration have identified the above strategies as they have been proven to yield success. Teachers have also agreed upon offering after school tutoring and the math coach will conduct boot camps and pull-outs.

Action Steps to Implement	
Ensuring that all Teachers have common planning (Scheduling)	
Person Responsible	Brooke Wigginton (brooke.wigginton@stlucieschools.org)
Administration attending all CLP's and ensuring they are being done with fidelity. To include progress monitoring, data analysis and classroom observations.	
Person Responsible	Brooke Wigginton (brooke.wigginton@stlucieschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Learning Gains & Achievement - Improving ELA Achievement and Learning gains both provide an opportunity for growth within the school. Specifically, as it relates to unpacking standards and providing options for students to not only meet but exceed the rigor of the standards. Additionally, we've identified the need for more structured collaborative planning sessions as well as a focus on teaching writing and rhetoric which are specific standards identified through data analysis as areas students struggle with.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will increase knowledge on implementing literacy strategies to support the Florida Standards and work collaboratively to plan and create assessments to adequately ascertain student knowledge. Specifically, all teachers will have common planning where an administrator will be present to lead the Collaborative Planning (CLP). Additionally, students will utilize progress monitoring strategies to track their own progress while preparing for standardized tests such as FSA, ACT & SAT.
Monitoring:	Teachers will participate in 120 minutes of Collaborative Planning weekly. Teachers will analyze student work samples, and plan target based lessons. Unit Assessments will conducted at the conclusion of each unit. This will measure student performance on standards. Data trackers will be utilized to ensure progress is being made. Literacy walk-throughs will occur weekly. This will ensure standard based instruction and will provided consistency amongst classroom teachers. Achieve 3000 data will be analyzed weekly. Student and teacher usage will be monitored in order to ensure a increase lexile levels . Writing Benchmark will be conducted quarterly. Writing trends will be identified and targeted remediation will be applied.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning (CLP's) monitored by the administrative team and conducted during common planning periods. Specifically, all English teachers teaching like sections will plan together. For example, English 1 teachers will have Period 2 planning, and English 4 will have Period 4 planning, and so on. This will ensure that teachers work together to create rigorous lessons based on the identified standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensuring that all teachers work together collaboratively to design quality lessons and streamlining the planning and data evaluation process.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensuring that all Teachers have the same planning period (Scheduling)

Person Responsible	Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)

Administration attending all CLP's and ensuring they are being done with fidelity. To include progress monitoring, data analysis and classroom observations.

Person Responsible	Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Port St. Lucie High School is ranked 94 of 505 high schools statewide as it relates to discipline. Based on the Safe Schools dashboard this indicates our school has very low school incidences. In fact, only 1.5 incidents per 100 students were reported.

The primary concern is Violent Incidents which is considered middle in the state as we are rated 216 of 505 schools and 4 out of 7 schools locally. In 2019 there were 101 out-of-school suspensions and 88 in-school suspensions. Although this was a decrease from the prior year of 144 out-of-school and 160 in-school.

The secondary concern is Other Discipline Referrals (ODR's) which include minor offenses such as dress code and disrespect which usually result in lunch detentions and other office-managed consequences. However, as students refuse to abide by the consequence, it leads to larger discipline issues in addition to vaping which is an epidemic amongst teens.

We will continue to monitor and create a safe and caring environment where students can feel safe and cared for by continuing our work with Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and utilizing incentives and rewards for behavior. We will also continue focusing on creating community through our school-wide Social Emotional Learning initiatives and ensure that every student finds an adult on campus they can connect with.

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.

At Port St. Lucie High School we believe that every child can and will learn. We strive to create an environment where all students feel safe and cared for. Building positive relationships is the first step to ensure that this mission is met. Single school culture is essential to the success of the school and during the preplanning week all on-campus stakeholders are charged with reviewing the school's mission and vision along with the expectations for the school year. Parent/community meetings are held throughout the year to encourage dialog and support the school to home connection such as Student-led Conferences and Parent/Agency Nights for ESE and ESOL, as well as through our School Advisory Council (SAC), and unique arts programs. Through social media and the school website, information is freely shared with families.

As a one to one school, where each student and teacher are provided with a laptop; technology is a major component of our culture and environment. Families without computer or internet access are supported through the Parent communication room located in the main office, where they can access a computer and print if needed. Through partnerships with the community, families are connected to resources and can rely on the school to offer support and assistance when needed. This in turn creates a positive school culture where all stakeholders receive the necessary communication and feel valued and supported.

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

The entire administrative team and staff work towards building a positive school culture and a safe and caring environment. Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is a major focus and each staff member is trained annually on SEL strategies and expected to incorporate them into their curriculum daily. Teachers are encouraged to greet students with a warm welcome at the door daily and offer them the opportunity to share their thoughts through various activities. New this year, students begin each day with a moment of silence, which they can use for self reflection or any other silent activity.

The following SEL Goals were identified for the 2021-2022 School Year
Goals

• In the area of School Climate: Port St Lucie High school plans to make a 4 point increase from spring 2020 to spring 2021.

• In the area of Rigorous Expectations: Port St Lucie High School plans to make a 7 point increase from

spring 2021 to spring 2022

• In the area of Social Awareness: Port St Lucie High School plans to make a 4 point increase from spring 2021 to spring 2022

Additionally, through the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) Team, initiatives and incentives are provided to encourage student attendance and address other discipline concerns. We are working towards providing a strong sense of community, where students are encouraged to get involved in the many after school clubs, organizations and athletics available so they can feel rewarded and a part of the school family.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00