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

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

1801 PANTHER LN, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

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

Demographics

Principal: David Alfonso

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2021

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)	79%
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* 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%)
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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	69%

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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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.

Fort Pierce Westwood will become the premier educational center in St. Lucie 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 to equip 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lezeau, Joseph	Principal	Principal of Fort Pierce Westwood Academy. He oversees all school operations, monitors his Administrative staff, and supervises non-instructional office staff.
Woltjen, Fred	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include the oversight of Student Services and Curriculum, the 11th grade student body and the Social Studies department.
Roy, Matthew	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include Technology and Assessment, English and Reading departments, the 9th grade student body along with Culinary and Criminal Justice.
Miller, Monica	School Counselor	Guidance Director
Poole, Hilary	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include oversight over the Marine Oceanographic Academy (MOA), JROTC, Foreign Language and the MOA student body.
Smith, Nicole	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. Her main duties include oversight of Facilities and Activities, Discipline, Technology CTE, Fine Arts, the 12th-grade student body, and the Math department.
Beem, Barbara	Instructional Coach	Main responsibility is Literacy
Power, Jacob	Math Coach	Main duties include coaching Math teachers and NEST
Quinones-Rheingold, Sandra	Instructional Coach	Math Interventionist
Coffman, Michelle	Other	School Psychologist
Eliassaint, Fedna	Other	School Based Social Worker
Ford, Kendra	Other	Teacher on Special Assignment working with the MTSS process and NEST
Taylor, Leslie	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. Her duties include oversight of Science, Science CTE, Magnet implementation and monitoring, Professional learning for new and veteran teachers and 10th grade student body.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/13/2021, 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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

83

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,003

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

15

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

23

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	537	496	461	348	1842
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308	272	287	211	1078
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	57	30	22	192
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	229	105	25	523
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	100	140	53	396
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	158	99	44	509
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	173	133	24	471
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	266	212	1	721

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	343	317	274	103	1037

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16	12	21	65

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	209	198	223	191	821
One or more suspensions	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	19	29	90	8	146
Course failure in Math	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	185	134	148	119	586
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	23	22	21	83

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	588	521	482	353	1944
Attendance below 90 percent	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	110	129	126	77	442
Course failure in ELA	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	12	42	23	18	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	23	22	21	83

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				41%	51%	56%	38%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				39%	48%	51%	50%	52%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				21%	36%	42%	37%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				27%	40%	51%	30%	40%	51%
Math Learning Gains				26%	41%	48%	40%	47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				26%	38%	45%	36%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				63%	71%	68%	59%	68%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				52%	68%	73%	49%	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	41%	54%	-13%	55%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	36%	51%	-15%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	60%	71%	-11%	67%	-7%
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	49%	68%	-19%	70%	-21%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	16%	51%	-35%	61%	-45%
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	32%	55%	-23%	57%	-25%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We use district created unit assessments that are aligned to the tested state standards seen on the FSA and EOC. We monitor through a platform called Performance Matters which houses our students data and has the capacity for us to filter in many ways to extrapolate cohort data, not just for proficiency but early warning systems.
ELA, Math and Biology uses remediation platforms that progress monitor as well. These include Achieve 3000, USA Test Prep, Florida Standards, Math Nation, and Khan academy.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	29	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	24	15
	Students With Disabilities	8	3	2
	English Language Learners	3	1	1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	19	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	15	7
	Students With Disabilities	6	.08	4
	English Language Learners	.01	.09	5
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57	56	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	53	51
	Students With Disabilities	30	33	31
	English Language Learners	29	24	33
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	25	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	25	0
	Students With Disabilities	50	0	0
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	59	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	55	26
	Students With Disabilities	9	38	9
	English Language Learners	.02	0.6	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	17	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	18	42
	Students With Disabilities	20	0.6	26
	English Language Learners	16	13	43
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	61	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	60	67
	Students With Disabilities	39	42	45
	English Language Learners	21	38	54
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	50	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	50	63
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	0
	English Language Learners	33	0	0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	67	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	67	22
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	0
	English Language Learners	0	33	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	9	10
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	9	9
	Students With Disabilities	23	0	4
	English Language Learners	26	13	6
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	25	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	13	22
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	50
	English Language Learners	0	17	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	65	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	66	68
	Students With Disabilities	32	56	45
	English Language Learners	44	58	58

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	33	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	20	33
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	.9	1.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	.9	.5
	Students With Disabilities	.3	1	0
	English Language Learners	.3	1	.5
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	50	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	54	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	NA
	English Language Learners	33	67	67
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	73	91	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	88	86
	Students With Disabilities	0	50	0
	English Language Learners	100	100	100

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	14	15	13	15	23	24	37	37		93	35
ELL	8	25	28	7	21	31	18	5		95	48
BLK	25	29	20	10	23	30	42	27		97	60
HSP	40	37	23	17	20	30	65	42		95	64
MUL	19	29		30						100	62

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	64	57		42	31	15	85	83		94	95
FRL	32	34	22	13	22	27	50	38		96	65

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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

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	42
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	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	89%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30

Students With Disabilities	
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	48
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	63
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The subgroups of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities were below 41% for the 2nd year. All core subject areas lagged behind the district and state averages for the 2019 assessments. Core subject areas trended towards reducing the gap between the district and state averages.

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

Looking at the progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, Algebra proficiency and Geometry proficiency. Algebra lagged behind the district (-35) and state (-45) while Geometry lagged behind the district (-23) and the state (-25).

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

Students entering 9th grade were not proficient from their previous assessment of the 2019 state assessment. The school will bring on a math interventionist to pull small groups and provide tier 2 and tier 3 supports to these students. Students will also be scheduled into a math class to help support their understanding before being scheduled into Algebra. The MTSS process is strengthened to aggressively monitor students in math classes for behavior, attendance and academics.

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

9th grade ELA proficiency and Biology proficiency were areas that showed the most improvement. Although both still lagged behind the district and state the measures between each were reduced year over year.

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

Focus on the collaborative planning process and having instructional teams remain the same year over year. The school and district had made collaborative planning a focus and incorporated time in

the school day for this to occur within core subject area teams. The meetings were led by the team lead and supported by the assistant principal over that team.

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

The school will need to continue to support the collaborative planning process as we have new staff that will need to be trained in the process and supported throughout the year. Teachers will incorporate the use of exemplars in the collaborative planning process along with intentionally planning for high effect size strategies. All staff will work to reconnect with students and help them to reestablish as we transition back to full time for all students in the building.

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.

Professional development was provided for teachers on Social Emotional Learning (SEL) during preschool and will be part of the professional development throughout the year to support both the students and adults in the building. Teachers will be provided training on collaborative planning. There will be training on Single School Culture with a focus on reconnecting and building relationships.

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

An MTSS coordinator will be added to support teachers with the MTSS process and ensure students are getting supports as needed across attendance, academics and behavior. Along with the MTSS coordinator, the school will continue to provide support to teachers through a math coach and a literacy coach to support their growth and improvement. The school has a third dean of students to manage the behavioral occurrences in a more rapid response to move to an approach of proactive rather than reactive response.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FPWA hired 28 positions this year that are directly linked to school grade acquisition ranging from classroom teachers to paraprofessionals. Many are experienced educators from other districts and we will need to onboard them with our practices, paradigms and principles. The collaborative planning process focuses on standards aligned instruction coupled with research driven, deliberate and engaging lessons for our students. The rationale is when there is a highly effective process rich with protocols in place, the result will be an increase in all of our tested subject area state test scores leading to an improvement in the school grade.
Measurable Outcome:	Specific changes in the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and behaviors we expect to occur as a result of our area of focus include an increase in teacher and student efficacy, a strong alignment between standards and collaboratively planned instruction as well as a high level of active engagement in class from students. Baseline data collected from state assessments in 2019 and 2021 will be used as a measure of growth for standards aligned instruction with each unit assessment this year. The synergy generated from collaborative planning groups leads to a strengthened sense of confidence when teaching the students and an improved efficacy around the expected improvements. In addition student and teacher attendance rates will be used to gauge eagerness to attend school and engage in daily instruction.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by Administration through CLP observations and participation as well as unit assessment results. Weekly CLP meetings for each of the content areas, specifically tested subjects, are attended by supervising Administration and the Principal as a collaborator, observer and oversight. Administration and members of the Leadership team will observe planned lessons and monitor for effective delivery. Actionable feedback will be provided often and monitored for implementation through classroom observations and at the CLP table. The progress in areas of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Economically Disadvantaged students will be monitored through unit assessments and teacher generated assessments. Students needing additional assistance will be referred to attend our after school "8th period" for tutoring and additional support. After school programming will use tracking sheets to monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative lesson planning with the use of protocols is the evidence based strategy implemented for this area of focus. CLPs further focus on the breakdown of standards, alignment of evidenced based teaching strategies, common assessments, student exemplar analysis, and a data cycle to monitor progress and guide remediation and reteaching.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There is a considerable amount of research to support the effectiveness of CLP practices. The research results are strengthened by the use of protocols that promote student work analysis and collaborative iteration of expectations and tasks assigned. The CLP practice is deeply entrenched in data based decision making around classroom, school, district and state data sources around student assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

The master schedule supports teachers who teach the same or similar subjects to have the same planning time.

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

The Principal and Assistant Principals attend CLPs weekly to observe, collaborate and monitor the process. This is protected time in the school duty and supervision schedule.

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

Administration and Team leaders lead data chats with CLPs around expected and actual results post collaboratively planned instruction.

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

Professional learning in CLPs around evidence based instructional strategies with high effect sizes to build robust toolkits.

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Looking at the data from our climate survey and our discipline data, social and emotional learning will be targeted to focus on building better student - student relationships and better student - teacher relationships. Students reported that they did not feel connected to their teacher when looking at our climate survey. With in-person learning returning in full, it will be incumbent on teachers and staff to cultivate student relationships as they return to campus. The focus on SEL will also support reducing incidents of violence between students as we work to create opportunities through lessons and activities for students to work on managing their emotions.
Measurable Outcome:	There will be a reduction in the number of referrals for incidents that would be considered violent as compared to the data from the latest school year 2019-2020 from the SafeScoolsforAlex.org data. There will be an increase in the percentage of students that respond agree or strongly agree to the the prompt that they feel connected to their teacher on the climate survey.
Monitoring:	The administration will monitor the number of referrals through our dashboard PowerBi which provides a real time view of all referrals written on our campus. The monitoring will be supplemented by the Deans and our MTSS process when looking at students who have behavior/discipline concerns. The progress towards students feeling more connected to their teachers will be monitored through our Fall and Spring climate surveys.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Leader in Me curriculum and its SEL strategies are CASEL endorsed. The three signature practices are evidenced based strategies. The school will use Ripple Effects to support our students with changing behavior and alternatives to Out of School suspension. MTSS will continue to be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The school sought out district support in selecting Ripple Effects and training for our Deans and BIC monitors to meet the needs of our students. As a school with traditionally higher numbers of referrals, the school looked for interventions to be proactive not just reactive to student needs for behavior support. The Leader in Me curriculum builds on itself year over year and we will continue to implement the program as it provides substantial focus on SEL for both students and adults on our campus.

Action Steps to Implement

The school will provide professional development for any new staff member associated with the Ripple Effects program to be used in conjunction with our Deans.

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

All new staff members to the school will be provided Leader in Me training during pre-school week and throughout the year. Students and Adults partner to create the SEL lessons for the year and students teach lessons to their peers.

Person Responsible	Leslie Taylor (leslie.taylor@stlucieschools.org)

The school will ensure that students and staff are given the opportunity to complete the climate surveys in the Fall and Spring.

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

There will be monthly meetings for Deans to track referrals and interventions used through Ripple Effects. There will be weekly MTSS meetings where students who have been referred for support will be discussed.

Person Responsible Nicole Smith (nicole.smith@stlucieschools.org)

MTSS team will push into CLP's at the beginning of the year for a kickoff meeting to share with teachers how they will be supporting their students throughout the year. MTSS team will be available to push into CLP's throughout the school year to provide on-going support to teams.

Person Responsible Fred Woltjen (r.woltjen@stlucieschools.org)

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.

In looking at our data from the report, our primary area of focus will be reducing the number of violent incidents on our campus. The most recent data from SafeSchoolsforAlex.org is for the 2019-2020 school year listed an incidence rate of 2.38 per 100 students. The secondary area of focus will be to reduce the number of in-school and out of school suspensions for the coming school year. The most recent data from SafeSchoolsforAlex.org from the 2019-2020 school year listed an incidence rate of 36.4 suspensions per 100 students. The school will implement Ripple Effects, an alternative to suspension platform, to reduce the number of suspensions. There is a schoolwide focus on reconnecting and building relationships with students. Restorative justice practices will be used with our students and teachers to promote positive relationships and prevent future events.

In 2021-2022, the school will continue to build on the implementation of Leader in Me and PBIS systems. The primary and secondary focus go together such that reducing the number of violent incidents will in turn reduce the number of suspensions. The areas of focus reveal an area of need for our students to have better coping and de-escalation strategies and the social emotional literacy to appropriately communicate with others in disagreement. As the first Leader in Me high school in the state of Florida, we are building student leaders through deliberately aligning SEL lessons that are age appropriate and further empowering students to find and use their voice for positive global change. The school has leadership days multiple times a month to focus on the Leader in Me curriculum which is based on Stephen Covey's work. These leadership periods include student driven lessons that are led by students. In addition, the Leader in Me and 7 Habits curriculum is to be embedded into SEL signature practices daily in each class. The school has a SEL task force and Lead Team comprised of students and adults to continue to enhance SEL initiatives. Lastly, frequent surveys are completed by students and staff to identify growth and areas of opportunity. FPWA consistently uses the data collected to inform their practices.

Ft. Pierce Westwood Academy became a 2020-2021 Resilient FLPBIS Model School. The school will continue and enhance PBIS efforts for all students and staff. The school will monitor culture and climate through climate surveys at different times of the year to allow all stakeholders to provide feedback on how we are progressing in different areas. Discipline and behavior will be monitored through a district dashboard, Power Bi, that allows the school to see real time data on numbers of referrals and behavior incidents in the school. All administrators and deans have access to this dashboard and will be working proactively with teachers that may be having classroom management issues based on the data. All teachers will be greeting students at the door for each of their classes with a focus on improving student relationships.

Proactive practices promote socially and emotionally literate students and staff.

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.

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy 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. Fort Pierce Westwood Academy earned the PBIS award for being a Model Resilient school in 2020-2021. We will continue to build and implement our PBIS plan in the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Administration plays a role in supporting our positive school culture as we model the expectations for the students and staff and lead by that example. One of the tenets of our single school culture is that teachers greet our students at the door every period of each day to foster relationships and that feeling of welcome when students enter their room. PBIS is celebrated weekly with recognition over the announcements for students and staff alike that have been "caught" doing the right thing during the week. The past school year Fort Pierce Westwood Academy was recognized for being a Model resilient school for the first time. We have a student leadership team that develops lessons that align to Franklin-Covey's Leader in Me. These students leaders will lead lessons in classrooms for their fellow students and work to build capacity and expand our student leaders. These student leaders reinforce the student ownership of their learning and the school culture that supports. School Advisory Council (SAC) reflects parents and community member involvement in the school. The beginning of our 2021-2022 school year School Advisory Council (SAC) had the largest group of people in attendance in more than 5 years which reflects the positive culture. This large and diverse group will assist us in supporting our positive school culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**