Lakewood Park Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lakewood Park Elementary School

7800 INDRIO RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34951

http://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/lwp/

Demographics

Principal: Kathleen Melrose

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
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 (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (43%)
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.](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

Lakewood Park Elementary School

7800 INDRIO RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34951

http://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/lwp/

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

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.

Our mission is to work together to provide a safe, respectful and nurturing environment that builds foundational skills for lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to be a kindness focused, top choice, A-rated, premier education center that prepares and motivates all students for a rapidly-changing world.

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
Walukiewicz, Kerri	Principal	
Gomez, Nikki	Assistant Principal	
Deubel, Mattie	Instructional Coach	
Egan, Sarah	Instructional Coach	
Farr, Laurie	Instructional Coach	
Carter, Charlene	Teacher, K-12	ELA Interventionist
Forsyth, Mary	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist
Steward, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Math Interventionist
Garcia, Zulay	Teacher, K-12	Behavior Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Kathleen Melrose

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

613

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

12

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	49	64	51	37	31	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	1	9	9	6	9	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	10	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	42	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	42	51	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	4	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	2	15	4	42	48	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

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

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	66	116	106	102	102	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	10	50	57	30	36	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	5	12	1	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	4	8	1	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	66	116	106	102	102	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	10	50	57	30	36	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	5	12	1	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	4	8	1	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				39%	50%	57%	34%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	55%	58%	46%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	54%	53%	60%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	53%	63%	45%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				29%	50%	62%	45%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	42%	51%	36%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	46%	53%	36%	51%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	43%	50%	-7%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	48%	-21%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	21%	47%	-26%	60%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	34%	46%	-12%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for K-5 was iReady Diagnostics. Fifth grade science progress monitoring data was monitored using the district created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	11	22
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	12	21
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	5	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	6	18
	Students With Disabilities	9	0	10
	English Language Learners	7	7	7

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	55	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	56	80
	Students With Disabilities	29	43	63
	English Language Learners	38	44	78
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51	62	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	62	74
	Students With Disabilities	29	43	38
	English Language Learners	31	56	89

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	56	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	51	60
	Students With Disabilities	21	20	33
	English Language Learners	13	31	38
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	61	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	57	68
	Students With Disabilities	21	20	27
	English Language Learners	7	44	63

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	62	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	58	66
	Students With Disabilities	33	15	33
	English Language Learners	35	28	26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	61	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	59	78
	Students With Disabilities	16	20	48
	English Language Learners	12	33	42

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	51	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	55	52
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	13
	English Language Learners	25	38	38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56	52	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	56	52
	Students With Disabilities	36	20	13
	English Language Learners	40	38	38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	38	44	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	48	46
	Students With Disabilities	18	8	9
	English Language Learners	35	9	33

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	21	6		20	12		29				
ELL	28	38		28	14		26				
BLK	35	31	17	28	8		18				
HSP	30	38		25	13		14				
MUL	69			62							
WHT	45	58		40	16		42				
FRL	37	43	18	31	12	5	26				

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	21	41	50	27	31	38	21				
ELL	30	54	47	40	32	36	11				
BLK	27	45	48	33	25	38	25				
HSP	36	53	60	42	28		20				
MUL	53			47							
WHT	51	51		57	34	60	58				
FRL	29	44	48	36	25	31	26				

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	19	47	55	19	31	32	21				
ELL	26	50	69	37	24		9				
BLK	25	42	58	36	41	35	22				
HSP	32	47	64	40	34		39				
MUL	27	30		55	50						
WHT	43	48	58	55	55	36	45				
FRL	29	46	68	41	42	30	31				

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	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	219

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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	30
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	24
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	27
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	27
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?

Fifth grade students showed the lowest performance in ELA, math, and science.
SWD, FRL, and black students performed low in overall ELA achievement.
SWD performed low in math achievement.
SWD, black, and Hispanic students performed low in math learning gains.
SWD, ELL, Hispanic, and ED (FRL) students are all below the federal index of 41%.
Fourth and fifth grade teacher content knowledge and teaching experience was a contributing factor to the overall low performance.
Lack of teacher retention in intermediate grades is an additional contributing factor.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest gap compared to the state average.
Fourth and fifth grade teacher content knowledge and teaching experience was a contributing factor to the low performance.
Lack of teacher retention in the intermediate grades is an additional contributing factor.

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

Math learning gains show the greatest gap compared to the state average.
Fourth and fifth grade teacher content knowledge and teaching experience was a contributing factor to last year's low performance.
Lack of teacher retention in intermediate grades is an additional contributing factor.

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

Third grade achievement in both ELA and math went up 9% when comparing year to year.
Teacher retention and utilizing LLI in third grade aided in this improvement.

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

Seventeen percent of our students are below ninety percent for attendance. Social worker and attendance support from Boys and Girls Club to increase student attendance.

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

1. Meeting the intent of the grade level standards.
2. Student processing the critical content using Kagan strategies.
3. Teacher and student accountability via data meetings and student led conferences.
4. Small group instruction - standards based and meeting the individual student needs
5. Student behavior - single school culture and social emotional learning
6. Attendance
7. Monthly math PD
8. Weekly quality instruction PD

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.

1. PD on the intent of the grade level standards.
2. Kagan PD on student processing the critical content.
3. PD on teacher and student accountability via data meetings and student led conferences.
4. PD on small group instruction - standards based and meeting the individual student needs.
5. PD on student behavior - single school culture and social emotional learning.
6. Monthly grade level math PD.
7. Weekly quality instruction PD.
8. New Teacher PD to support quality instruction, single school culture, and schoolwide expectations.

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

Instructional coaches will provide teachers with professional development on how to implement the benchmarks/standards to the intended rigor. Teachers will attend day one and two of Kagan professional development. This is geared toward all students being active, engaged members of the classroom learning environment where they all process the information. Lastly, the two interventionist will meet with students to close achievement gaps in both reading and math. Social worker and attendance support from Boys and Girls Club to increase student attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of student achievement subgroup data indicates SWDs, ELLs, black, Hispanic, and EDs are not achieving at the same rate as their peers. Analysis of student achievement in fifth grade also indicates a cohort decline in ELA, math, and science.
Measurable Outcome:	If we work collaboratively to develop and implement grade level lessons based on data and the intent of the Florida Standards with accountability of all stakeholders, the proficiency and learning gains will increase to the federal index of 41%.
Monitoring:	Throughout the school year unit assessments and i-ready diagnostics will be used to measure the overall outcome by subgroup. At the end of the year we will use the FSA data for students in grades 3-5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerri Walukiewicz (kerri.walukiewicz@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide approach to planning and implementing standards based instruction and small group instruction for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Align the instructional planning for whole group following the gradual release model. Focusing on the critical content for each day.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development on CLPs.

Person Responsible	Kerri Walukiewicz (kerri.walukiewicz@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor weekly lesson plans - alignment to the Florida Standards, BEST Benchmarks, and SLPS scope and sequence.

Person Responsible	Kerri Walukiewicz (kerri.walukiewicz@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor teaching and learning - alignment to the Florida Standards, BEST Benchmarks, and SLPS scope and sequence.

Person Responsible	Kerri Walukiewicz (kerri.walukiewicz@stlucieschools.org)

Professional development to improve teacher quality.

Person Responsible	Kerri Walukiewicz (kerri.walukiewicz@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of teacher and student climate results, student discipline data, student and staff attendance data indicate a need to address the social emotional needs of our school. Students and staff have also been working or learning from home for 22 weeks due to COVID-19.
Measurable Outcome:	If we implement social emotional learning, then we will equip all students with skills to self-regulate as measured by a 20% decrease in code calls, ODRs/BIRs, and suspensions, as well as increase attendance among students with attendance below 90%.
Monitoring:	Monthly monitoring of the BIRS and referrals entered by grade, student, and teacher. Shared monthly at faculty meetings and the MTSS B meetings. This will also be monitored and measured twice through the SEL student survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Harmony - Meet up, Buddy up, and daily lessons SEL resource for all students K-5 Bullying prevention MTSS - Tier II and III behavior Second Step PTR-FBA Tough Kids Safer Smarter SEL Committee ALTOS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students are lacking many of the basic life skills needed for success in school, at home, and in the community. Intentional focus on cultivating SEL competencies is a proven strategy used to reduce discipline concerns, increase attendance, and develop positive learning communities.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development on Buddy up and Meet up.

Person Responsible	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)

Professional development on the daily Sanford Harmony lessons.

Person Responsible	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)

Professional development on our school-wide SEL plan.

Person Responsible	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)

Monitoring and fidelity walks during Harmony.

Person Responsible	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)

Bullying and harassment PD and follow-up lessons.

Person Responsible	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)

PD on single school culture and school-wide expectations.

Person Responsible	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Grades 3, 4, and 5 are below 50% for proficiency in ELA. Third grade is currently at 36% proficient. Fourth grade is at 37% proficient. Fifth grade is at 35% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2022, 51% students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency in ELA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using unit assessments, i-Ready diagnostics, K-2 monitoring assessments and tiered intervention (LLI) progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerri Walukiewicz (kerri.walukiewicz@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tier 2 interventions (LLI) with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes. Use Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our school literacy plan. Our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group. (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments, and i-Ready).

Person Responsible	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor the implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention

Person Responsible	Kerri Walukiewicz (kerri.walukiewicz@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback.

Person Responsible	Nikki Gomez (elizabeth.gomez@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.

The primary area of concern are any physical incidents that take place on campus; specifically bullying, battery, harassment, and threats. This will be monitored monthly in several capacities. First, all threat assessments are monitored through a team and then a plan is put in place for each student. Additionally, all behavior data is first reviewed prior to school beginning to ensure action is proactive. Students with previous discipline histories will be assigned a mentor and/or placed in a social emotional group. Additionally, as faculty we review the data and problem solve as a collective whole.

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.

Lakewood Park Elementary will host an open house bash, where families can not only meet our staff but have dinner and participate in an obstacle course. There are also several planned events given it is safe to do so due to COVID-19. This will be assessed on a monthly basis. The community has also partnered with Lakewood Park to ensure we can host a socially distance Kids at Hope tunnel.

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

Tina Carr is our social emotional learning resource teacher for all students in grades K-5. She will met the critical content for the health education standards through the following topics; Helping Kids Manage Feelings and Emotions, Teaching Kids to Make Active Choices, Be Mindful About Healthy Choices, Change Your Thinking and Motivate Your Mood, Add Action to Your Day, Having a fit Mindset Leads to Healthy Choices, Teaching Kids About Mindfulness, Teaching Kids to recharge their Bodies.
Zulay Garcia is a our behavior specialist she will work with teachers and students alike with proactive structures and strategies for students based on previous and current data.
Additionally the staff work collaboratively to develop and implement our school wide Single School Culture script. The script is done working

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
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**