

St. Lucie Public Schools

St. Lucie West K 8 School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

St. Lucie West K 8 School

1501 SW CASHMERE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

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

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Lezeau

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	67%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (60%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

St. Lucie West K 8 School

1501 SW CASHMERE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

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

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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	54%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

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 at St. Lucie West K-8 School is to ensure a safe, challenging and engaging learning environment, tailored to individual student needs, while preparing for future success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Lucie West K-8 School will provide a high quality education to a diverse community of lifelong learners where all share the responsibility of learning.

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
Gardner, Eldrique	Principal	
Monroe, Lorie	Assistant Principal	
Sutton, Barbara	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/1/2015, Joseph Lezeau

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

78

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,489

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

8

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

13

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	125	146	152	152	161	165	235	252	239	0	0	0	0	1627
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	4	10	7	13	11	12	51	49	28	0	0	0	0	185
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	8	5	1	0	27	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	5	33	3	25	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	22	22	57	46	36	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	37	44	92	51	58	0	0	0	0	313
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/2/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				65%	60%	61%	61%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	58%	59%	58%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	54%	51%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				64%	58%	62%	64%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				59%	56%	59%	65%	57%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	46%	52%	50%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				64%	58%	56%	60%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				72%	74%	78%	72%	74%	77%

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	69%	50%	19%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	48%	24%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2021					
	2019	58%	51%	7%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
07	2021					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	52%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	55%	13%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	47%	21%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
07	2021					
	2019	61%	50%	11%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2021					
	2019	44%	34%	10%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	46%	18%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	59%	48%	11%	48%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	67%	4%	71%	0%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	51%	45%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

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-8 was iReady Diagnostics. Science and Civics progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	25	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	16	34
	Students With Disabilities	17	7	13
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	25	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	19	41
	Students With Disabilities	17	7	15
	English Language Learners	7	7	20

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	33	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	29	33
	Students With Disabilities	11	0	14
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	25	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	22	31
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	8
	English Language Learners	8	0	7
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	72	77	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	48	60
	Students With Disabilities	41	48	60
	English Language Learners	60	33	83
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	73	83	94
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	81	92
	Students With Disabilities	41	57	78
	English Language Learners	40	67	83

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78	85	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	71	78	83
	Students With Disabilities	31	47	46
	English Language Learners	91	73	91
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76	83	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	77	80
	Students With Disabilities	44	38	50
	English Language Learners	64	91	100
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76	78	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	76	72
	Students With Disabilities	33	32	35
	English Language Learners	64	52	52
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82	84	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	78	82	79
	Students With Disabilities	40	32	29
	English Language Learners	85	83	78
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	66	65	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	58	59
	Students With Disabilities	38	36	33
	English Language Learners	50	36	67

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	48	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	41	42
	Students With Disabilities	30	25	29
	English Language Learners	0	9	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57	49	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	45	47
	Students With Disabilities	28	30	35
	English Language Learners	40	9	40
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	53	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	47	52
	Students With Disabilities	18	25	14
	English Language Learners	0	17	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	62	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	52	56
	Students With Disabilities	25	37	32
	English Language Learners	27	36	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	41	33	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	31	28
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	16
	English Language Learners	27	13	13

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	59	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	48	58
	Students With Disabilities	19	20	21
	English Language Learners	0	0	13
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23	25	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	17	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	51	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	43	44
	Students With Disabilities	26	18	28
	English Language Learners	0	0	9

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	25	39	33	25	40	39	24	25			
ELL	37	45	32	36	40	43	32	43			
ASN	75	69		94	77						
BLK	48	51	53	37	40	31	41	48	71		
HSP	51	50	34	50	40	41	60	62	79		
MUL	55	38	10	56	35		59	42			
WHT	64	57	37	58	50	50	70	58	90		
FRL	49	46	37	43	41	40	50	55	83		
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	20	37	28	25	32	19	10	16			
ELL	42	46	30	47	49	34	41	53			

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
ASN	82	75		82	88						
BLK	55	55	36	47	50	34	54	70	94		
HSP	69	60	42	70	60	42	64	71	96		
MUL	58	55		50	37	9	23				
WHT	70	62	49	72	64	45	75	75	98		
FRL	60	56	40	58	57	35	58	66	95		
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	21	42	40	21	42	40	21	25			
ELL	38	65	75	42	53	56		62			
ASN	65	72		78	78						
BLK	53	55	55	49	57	41	47	62	94		
HSP	60	63	64	68	68	60	60	72	89		
MUL	58	58	42	45	50		42				
WHT	67	56	33	71	67	52	66	79	91		
FRL	55	57	49	60	62	48	52	66	92		

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	54
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	540
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	79
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	47
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	52
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	42
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	59
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	50
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?

In all reporting categories we are performing behind previous Achievement Levels. This trend is consist with district and state reportings. Students decline in scores are due to lack of fluency to facilitate the ultimate goal of comprehension and application. The area with the downward trend is most pronounced is in math.

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

The lowest performance area was seen in Math. This includes overall math performance of the lowest 25th percentile group, we scored 39% in this area. As a district, we significantly decreased in this performance area scoring 46%, seeing a decrease among similar schools countywide.

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

Pacing calendar are accelerated for the needs of our students to master the content before moving forward. Reteach and remediation time will be embedded in the schedule and pacing guide. Furthermore the rigor and complexity of the questions assessed on the state assessments are high; whereas, the textbooks and resources are not meeting this level but the teachers are adapting their lesson plans to meet this level using appropriate resource

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

Our Math Learning Gain achievement performance area showed the most improvement with an overall increase of 6%. This was the area of focus and the SIP goal for 2018-2019, to increase math learning gains by 5%. However, the current data trends requires consider how this was accomplished.

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

This was accomplished by strategic targeted professional development focused on high-intensity standards, chunking essays, modeled-lesson delivery by our district personnel, and administrative or instructional data chats. Teams focused on differentiated instruction following diagnostic assessments to guide collaborative planning among teachers within teams/departments; There was a schoolwide emphasis on instruction, as a tiered intervention as part of an RtI intervention. Furthermore, the math teachers spent a day each quarter having data

charts with their students to discuss in detail math fluency data and provide explicit feedback on how to improve scores.

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

The form of collaborative planning teams. Teams will focus on differentiated instruction following diagnostic assessment to guide collaborative planning for opportunities for reteach and remediation. Teams will also need to develop fluency strategies for skills and word recognition and use the established time of RtI appropriately.

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 training will continue with math initiatives from the state. The school will adjust schedules to support math with school experts.

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

Small group Instruction
On-going Professional Development from district in math
Continued camps

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math performance decreased in all subgroups. We can identify and target these students in targeted grade levels to provide them with intense, remedial instruction to supplement their current curriculum in order to narrow the gap they have and move them towards learning gains and ultimately to proficiency. Increase students achievement and technological proficiency through all virtual platforms during daily implementation of classroom instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Students within the identified subgroups of SWD 27% and Multi-racial based on our ESSA data will increase overall performance by 5% .We anticipate seeing an overall increase in this performance area in all of our minority students as evidenced by iReady Diagnostic, Unique Learning System Progress Monitoring Tool, FSA and FSAA.
Monitoring:	Collaborative Planning time will be scheduled. Teachers will use CLP to discuss Unique and Iready data. Administration and ESE chairs will attend meeting
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eldrique Gardner (eldrique.gardner@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be provided small group remediation for skills not mastered as identified through progress monitoring. Groups will be fluid and flexible depending on the skill
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction using jigsaw strategies for remediation allows students to be given specific instruction on skills not mastered. Small group instruction and jigsaw strategies are high yield with an effect size of nearly 2 yrs growth.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of teacher survey results, Panorama Student Survey data, student discipline data, and staff and student attendance data indicate a need to address the social emotional learning needs of our school.
Measurable Outcome:	1. Teacher perception of student behavioral concerns as measured by the district teacher climate survey will decrease by 30%. 2. Student perception of sense of belonging and safety will increase by 25% as measured by the Panorama student survey.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony/Lions Quest/School-Connect will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walkthrough tools. An SEL committee will be established to promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students are lacking many of the basic life skills needed for success inschool, at home and in the community. Intentional focus on cultivating SELcompetencies is a proven strategy used to reduce discipline concerns,increase attendance and develop positive learning communities.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

According to our 2019 data for combination schools, SLWK8 has 0.3 incidents per 100 students ranking us 57 out of 313. The state average is 1.6 incidents Per 100 students. SLWK8 is ranked #3/11 in SLPS. This is considered Very Low on this platform. An area of concern which the report highlights in the Suspension Information is our ranking as Very High as compared to the state we are #302/313 with 22.6 suspensions per 100 students. We are a PBIS and Kids and Hope supported by our Single School Culture. We will continue to closely monitor our habitual repeaters and provide them support through mentoring and strategies with small groups

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.

We strive to have a welcoming school climate that provides families with exceptional customer service and informational resources to create supportive environments that far extend the child's classroom. We have received our surveys from students, parents, and teachers. The results were SLWK8 is a safe place. It is a learning environment that allow students to be creative, problem solvers. SLWK8 has embraced SEL which allow students to transition from extrinsic to intrinsic rewards. Our SEL for adults and students includes a minimum of 30 minutes in SEL Circles, with different topics ranging from personal and academic to world impact weekly. Our district's SEL supports visits and progress monitor. Our faculty and staff have received professional development in social-emotional learning and collaborate in problem-solving teams alongside deans, guidance, and administrators to find amicable solutions to build relations with students and parents while meeting the needs of our diverse population of students. We host several events throughout the year to welcome parents to our campus(virtually when possible) so that positive relations may be established and maintained among all stakeholders.

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

Eldrique Gardner, Principal create an environment for teachers and students that is positive and welcoming geared toward learning.

Teachers create an environment for students and parents that is positive and welcoming geared towards learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00