
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

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

Demographics

Principal: Brie Lamb

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2021

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)	72%
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 (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>64%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>72%</p>

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.

Windmill Point Elementary promises to nurture a positive school culture and to ensure academic excellence by preparing students for college and career readiness through the fostering of self-confidence, instillation of responsibility, and development of leadership skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Upon entering Windmill Point Elementary, you are met with a warm and inviting environment. When you enter our school, you are welcomed by faculty and staff members. As you walk the halls, you hear the chatter of children excitedly discussing the day's assignments. Glancing around, you notice authentic work that students have chosen to display. It is apparent that students feel secure and comfortable at Windmill Point.

As you continue through Windmill Point, you observe that everyone in the school believes it is important to discover what motivates children. Administration, faculty, and staff work collaboratively to design engaging work for students. Teachers are guided by their grade level scope and sequence and have a clear understanding of what students should know and be able to do. They use data from a variety of assessments, including engagement surveys, to guide instruction for each individual child. Faculty and staff strive to meet high expectations. They are lifelong learners and model this behavior for students. Teachers eagerly implement innovative ideas in their classroom and often share results with colleagues, parents, and community members.

Continuing your journey through our school, you see evidence of parent and community involvement. At Windmill Point Elementary, these citizens serve as partners in educating children. The community volunteers are valuable resources that are utilized to provide rich and authentic learning experiences for children. Administrators, teachers, and staff create opportunities for parental and community involvement to promote student achievement. All of the Windmill Point family is involved in the school decision making process, focusing on every aspect of the child's education.

Windmill Point Elementary is a unique school where everyone works together and supports one another. The ultimate goal is the continuous improvement of students, teachers, staff, and community partners as an integral part of our students' education.

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
Lamb, Brie	Principal	
Reals, Leah	Assistant Principal	
Mihajlovski, Virginia	Other	
Ackenbrack, Cara-Ann	Other	
Knab, Heather	Reading Coach	
Hsu, Kristen	School Counselor	
Stonecipher, Sharon	School Counselor	
Black, Lacey	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/19/2021, Brie Lamb

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

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

910

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

1

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

4

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	123	141	158	158	161	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	889
Attendance below 90 percent	29	30	31	44	45	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	5	0	4	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	29	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	25	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	44	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	36	50	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	17	10	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/19/2021

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	98	113	131	140	146	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	757
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	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	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	98	113	131	140	146	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	757
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	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	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				49%	50%	57%	50%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	55%	58%	49%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	54%	53%	54%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	53%	63%	50%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	50%	62%	38%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	42%	51%	28%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				40%	46%	53%	52%	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	49%	50%	-1%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	55%	18%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	47%	-13%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	46%	-7%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool that was used to compile the data below was 1st grade through 5th grade i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments that are given 3 times per year.

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		29	25	61
	Economically Disadvantaged		28	22	54
	Students With Disabilities		25	8	33
	English Language Learners		20	13	23
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		24	31	39
	Economically Disadvantaged		26	28	36
	Students With Disabilities		8	17	31
	English Language Learners		13	27	20
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
		Grade 2			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		29	26	35
	Economically Disadvantaged		22	24	33
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	8
	English Language Learners		5	4	13
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		18	10	22
	Economically Disadvantaged		13	9	23
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	9
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68	79	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	74	79
	Students With Disabilities	27	40	50
	English Language Learners	25	65	80
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72	83	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	75	84
	Students With Disabilities	33	27	63
	English Language Learners	45	65	80
	Grade 4			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69	73	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	70	70
	Students With Disabilities	42	46	45
	English Language Learners	50	59	56
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72	84	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	85	84
	Students With Disabilities	47	68	76
	English Language Learners	54	82	85

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		51	62	58
	Economically Disadvantaged		54	57	59
	Students With Disabilities		19	29	41
	English Language Learners		20	6	33
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		64	68	75
	Economically Disadvantaged		65	69	73
	Students With Disabilities		31	27	41
	English Language Learners		47	38	60
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		40	50	47
	Economically Disadvantaged		39	48	45
	Students With Disabilities		6	13	6
	English Language Learners		7	13	6
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	9	45	67	23	30	43					
ELL	35	57	64	44	35		20				
BLK	46	63		31	25		28				
HSP	44	51	58	50	36	30	35				
MUL	79			67							
WHT	64	69	92	62	50	54	51				
FRL	49	58	77	45	32	35	36				
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	18	48	53	24	48	55	21				
ELL	33	43	62	53	55	60	22				
BLK	47	52	46	46	46	52	30				

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
HSP	45	46	58	56	51	40	38				
MUL	52	47		54	50						
WHT	51	55	65	54	52	46	50				
FRL	47	52	59	52	48	44	36				
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	16	48	47	21	23	13	36				
ELL	28	50	67	40	44	40					
ASN	73			82							
BLK	43	51	71	35	23	14	32				
HSP	46	47	46	53	47	42	58				
MUL	56	31		56	38						
WHT	55	55	59	54	35	30	64				
FRL	46	46	54	46	35	27	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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	38
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	73
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The data component that showed the lowest performance was science achievement. The contributing factor of the low performance was the cohort of students lacked ELA proficiency in 2016-2017 (60% proficient), 2017-2018 (49% Proficient) and 2018-2019 (46% proficient).

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

The data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement was Math Learning Gains (37%) and Math Bottom Quartile (41%).

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement remote learners with poor engagement, quarantined students and poor attendance which left skill gaps in the core foundations of mathematics.

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

The data components are our self calculated 2020-2021 school year showing that 64% of students made a Learning Gain in ELA (up from 51% in 2019) and 73% of student in the ELA Bottom Quartile made a gain (up from 56% in 2019).

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

The contributing factors are coaching, modeling, MTSS, and foundational reading skills in primary grades.

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

The strategies will be ELA Modeling, literacy rounds, and additional small group instruction.

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.

The opportunities will that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders are CLPs, Quality Instruction, and Data Desegregation.

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

The additional services that will be implemented are coaching, small group instruction, and classroom walkthroughs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus	Adopting new B.E.S.T. standards throughout the school, it is a critical need to ensure that teachers understand and provided the support in using the standards to ensure a successful learning environment for students.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, students will increase reading proficiency by 5%, earning 58% proficiency, in ELA on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	It will be monitored by Benchmarks Unit Assessments, fidelity checks, and feedback to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create rigorous standards based instruction, review data/quality of instruction, create differentiated instruction, and to deepen the knowledge and understanding of standards with teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rational for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers (both general education and ESE teachers) create common lesson plans that are standards based, and to close learning gaps based on data for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common grade level CLP times facilitated by academic coaches with ESE support teachers included.
2. Additional CLP time after school and on early release days.
3. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, iReady data, common assessment data, and next steps.
4. Professional development on LLI and Differentiated Instruction.
5. Classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2018 38% of students had a Learning Gain in Math, in 2019 50% of students had a Learning Gain in Math, and in 2021 37% of students had a Learning Gain in Math which is below the state and district average.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, students will increase Learning Gains rate by 13% earning 50% gains on Math Learning Gains.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using Unit Assessment data, iReady data, and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create rigorous standards based instruction, review data/quality of instruction, create differentiated instruction, and to deepen the knowledge and understanding of standards with teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers (both general education and ESE teachers) create common lesson plans that are standards based, and to close learning gaps based on data for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common grade level CLP times facilitated by academic coaches with ESE support teachers included.
2. Additional CLP time after school and on early release days.
3. Additional support from district level academic coach (Chris Worley).
4. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, iReady data, common assessment data, and next steps.
5. Classroom walkthroughs.
6. Math Leader (Lacey Black) to facilitate CLP, model in classrooms, and to provide additional math small groups based on data.

Person Responsible: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science proficiency has become stagnate over the last year where our Science was at 40% proficient compared to the state at 53% and district at 46%.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, students will increase proficiency rate by 14% earning 54% proficiency on Science achievement.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome is the increase in Science based Unit Assessments and Science Pre-Post Tests compared to previous years.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is hands on science experiments that are aligned to standards based instruction. Students and teachers will be able to review experiments with the variables that each group or individual student to look at differentiation of results based on standards driven alignment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with all students by creating opportunities for students to engage in hands on experiments and to deepen a student's knowledge by exploring multiple concepts through hands-on, standards based learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common grade level times to organize and develop standards based experiments.
2. Bi-monthly CLP with district support (Beth Bonvie).
3. Additional CLP time after school and on early release days
4. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, common assessment data and next steps
5. Classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA. 4th grade is at 50% proficient and 5th is at 48% proficient (3rd grade met the threshold with 53% proficient).

Measurable Outcome: By the end of 2022, 51% students in grade 3,4,and 5 will show proficiency in ELA. 4th grade will increase by a minimum of 1% proficiency and 5th grade will increase by a minimum of 3% proficiency to meet 51% proficiency in grades 3,4,5.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using unit assessments, iReady Diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, k-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan)
- 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 district 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 – using monitoring schools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments).

Person Responsible Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Cara-Ann Ackenbrack (cara-ann.ackenbrack@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Heather Knab (heather.knab@stlucieschools.org)

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.

When compared to the discipline data of the schools across the state, Windmill Point ranks at 511 out of 1,395 schools. Discipline data showed that the state reported incident at Windmill Point is 0.3 per 100 students which falls into the low category. Each school is ranked based on their incident report from low to very high with school types in the violent incident, property incident, and drug/public order incidents. Windmill Point has demonstrated to show a very low rating.

To ensure the success of our students in pursuing their safety and school behavior expectations there will be periodic checks used through our monthly PBIS meetings and teacher surveys to support discipline during the upcoming school year.

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.

Windmill Point Elementary will build a positive school culture and environment by including parents, staff, and community members in the decision making and planning process by encouraging open lines of transparent communication and feedback. We will launch our year with Kindergarten Round-up, an event to welcome new students, provide parents a tour of the school, offer resources, and allow students to meet teacher and spend time in the learning environment. Additionally, we had our traditional Open House, where students and parents met their teacher, visited their classroom, and toured the school. Windmill Point Elementary will continue to have SAC (School Advisory Council) and PTO (Parent Teacher Organization) meeting monthly via TEAMS. We will provide meeting information and other parent involvement opportunities within our monthly newsletter and calendar. In addition, we will communicate daily via Student Planners, weekly via Tuesday Folders, and through ongoing use of School Messenger and Skyward.

Assessments and curriculum information will be discussed throughout the year. These times may include student led conferences, School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conferences, IEP meetings, PST meetings, and MTSS meetings. Progress monitoring, data, including, but not limited to FSA, iReady, and district assessments will be shared with parents during SAC meetings and parent conference.

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

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00