

St. Lucie Public Schools

Weatherbee Elementary 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Weatherbee Elementary School

800 E WEATHERBEE RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34982

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

Demographics

Principal: Angela Patton

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)	94%
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: D (40%)
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	20

Weatherbee Elementary School

800 E WEATHERBEE RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34982

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

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	84%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Weatherbee Elementary School is to encourage and ensure success for every child in a nurturing, motivating, and safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We at Weatherbee Elementary believe that maximum educational growth is achieved with the school, family, and community working together to meet the needs of each child.

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
Nigro, Kelly	Principal	Monitors school data, leads Leadership Team Meetings, assesses school-wide needs and initiates a plan.
Fess, Cassandra	Assistant Principal	Steps in when Principal is not on campus, assists in leadership team meetings, and school wide data assessment.
Buhrman, Stacey	Teacher, ESE	Serves as school based ESE Specialist and ensures compliance with ESE students and accommodations and needs. Schedules support teachers and paraprofessionals to work with students per their IEP needs. Reports to team about ESE school wide data and needs.
Keresteci, Deniz	Instructional Coach	ELA Instructional Coach. Works with teachers to model and implement coaching cycle. Assesses school wide data to determine ELA needs and reports to teams and helps develop plan to remediate. Participates in CLP's with ELA teachers.
	School Counselor	Works with students in 3-5 to meet their emotional and academic needs through the Problem Solving Team process. Advocates for community resources for students and families as needed. Runs the statewide testing needs of the school. Monitors student needs and works closely with teachers to model needs for behavior. Teaches SEL lessons to students in grades K-5.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/19/2021, Angela Patton

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.*

4

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

710

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

4

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	113	114	103	88	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	45	38	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	50	40	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

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	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	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

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	110	114	96	92	123	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	13	52	37	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	1	2	1	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	110	114	96	92	123	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	13	52	37	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	1	2	1	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	50%	57%	49%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	55%	58%	69%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	54%	53%	69%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				45%	53%	63%	53%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	50%	62%	68%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	42%	51%	63%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	46%	53%	58%	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	33%	50%	-17%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	48%	4%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	31%	55%	-24%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	47%	2%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	46%	2%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Weatherbee utilizes the Skyward reporting system, as well as Performance Matters to track the data compiled for economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners (ELL).

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	121	121	121
	Economically Disadvantaged	95/79%	95/79%	95/79%
	Students With Disabilities	12/10%	12/10%	12/12%
	English Language Learners	27/22%	27/22%	27/22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	121	121	121
	Economically Disadvantaged	95/79%	95/79%	95/79%
	Students With Disabilities	12/10%	12/10%	12/10%
	English Language Learners	27/22%	27/22%	27/22%
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	114	114	114
	Economically Disadvantaged	99/87%	99/87%	99/87%
	Students With Disabilities	12/11%	12/11%	12/11%
	English Language Learners	33/29%	33/29%	33/29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	114	114	114
	Economically Disadvantaged	99/87%	99/87%	99/87%
	Students With Disabilities	12/11%	12/11%	12/11%
	English Language Learners	33/29%	33/29%	33/29%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	102	102	102
	Economically Disadvantaged	89/87%	89/87%	89/87%
	Students With Disabilities	13/13%	13/13%	13/13%
	English Language Learners	31/30%	31/30%	31/30%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	102	102	102
	Economically Disadvantaged	89/87%	89/87%	89/87%
	Students With Disabilities	13/13%	13/13%	13/13%
	English Language Learners	31/30%	31/30%	31/30%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	88	88	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/88%	77/88%	77/88%
	Students With Disabilities	22/25%	22/25%	22/25%
	English Language Learners	21/24%	21/24%	21/24%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	88	88	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/88%	77/88%	77/88%
	Students With Disabilities	22/25%	22/25%	22/25%
	English Language Learners	21/24%	21/24%	21/24%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	101	101	101
	Economically Disadvantaged	86/85%	86/85%	86/85%
	Students With Disabilities	18/18%	18/18%	18/18%
	English Language Learners	30/30%	30/30%	30/30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	101	101	101
	Economically Disadvantaged	86/85%	86/85%	86/85%
	Students With Disabilities	18/18%	18/18%	18/18%
	English Language Learners	30/30%	30/30%	30/30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	101	101	101
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	86/85%	86/85%	86/85%
	Students With Disabilities	18/18%	18/18%	18/18%
	English Language Learners	30/30%	30/30%	30/30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	101	101	101
	Economically Disadvantaged	86/85%	86/85%	86/85%

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	13	32	46	15	42	50	28				
ELL	25	50	67	30	48	56	28				
BLK	22	41	45	22	25		29				
HSP	33	58	67	37	60	67	40				
WHT	41	63		39	44		32				
FRL	32	52	59	33	45	45	35				
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	33	55		50	50		50				
ELL	39	59	68	42	55	56	44				
BLK	30	56	63	36	51	42	48				
HSP	49	61	57	50	59	53	50				

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
WHT	64	71		55	52		58				
FRL	41	58	58	43	54	43	49				
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	33	69	75	45	79	75	33				
ELL	47	70	65	49	59	70	43				
BLK	33	69	73	42	61	59	52				
HSP	57	72	71	61	75	76	60				
WHT	58	61		56	70		65				
FRL	48	68	71	52	68	63	55				

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	45
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	44
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	
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	29
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	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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	44
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	43
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?

Students who are economically disadvantaged are prominent in every grade level and across all core content areas. These students score significantly below other students and consistently have higher attendance concerns, as well as needs for LEP or SWD.

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

Students across the bottom 25% of each grade level, need to be looked at especially in the area of math and science. These students consistently struggle and need more consistent intervention and support to help with their needs.

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

Contributing factors to this are the economic state that these students live in. Community resources are provided to the families. Taking a close look at these students data will help determine areas of need which can be supported in small group instruction as well as intervention groups, as well as after school tutorial programs.

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

Learning gains of the bottom 25% in ELA showed the most significant improvement.

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

Primary focus on small group instruction and ensuring these students had intervention and support.

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

Strategies that need to be implemented are ensuring teachers are trained in curriculum standards, small group instruction, and that there is a heavy emphasis placed on the CLP process and ensuring it is done with fidelity.

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.

CLP training
Curriculum Training
Small Group Training

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

Coaching support and modeling within the classroom setting, monitoring CLP's and ensuring data is looked at closely to determine student remediation needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students who are in the bottom quartile, as well as students who are close to making an academic gain on their FSA results, need to be targeted in order to ensure that these students are on track to make a gain on their next FSA assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Monitoring of performance matters for unit assessment/benchmark data to ensure that students are closely monitored from one unit of study to the next. Plan for remediation outlined for students, and check for understanding completed in order to ensure students has made the academic mastery of working towards improvement.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored in weekly data chats with grade groups. It will also be monitored by teachers who can track data with students in order to show needs and improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Nigro (kelly.nigro@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensuring small groups are fluid for each class and for each standard or target being taught. Data on I ready and Performance Matters utilized in order to determine groups so that students can be monitored for appropriate improvement. Ensuring teachers are collaboratively planning each week in every subject area so that lessons can be designed to meet student needs, plan for remediation discussed, as well as looking at what is acceptable for exemplar student work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we can get a good cycle of CLP and small groups targeting specific students going and look at the data consistently, then the strategies put into place can be measured to ensure students are making improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative Learning and Planning process training for teachers.

Person Responsible Kelly Nigro (kelly.nigro@stlucieschools.org)

Monitoring of CLP implementation and providing feedback and support.

Person Responsible Deniz Keresteci (deniz.keresteci@stlucieschools.org)

Weekly data chat meetings to ensure data is looked at and decisions are made to meet students needs.

Person Responsible Cassandra Fess (cassandra.fess@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focus on students in the bottom 25% as well as students who can make an academic gain on their FSA, due to learning loss from one FSA to another. One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA. We are currently at 32% proficient in grade 3, 22% proficient in grade 4, and 37% proficient in grade 5.
Measurable Outcome:	Monitoring of performance matters for unit assessment/benchmark data to ensure that students are closely monitored from one unit of study to the next. Plan for remediation outlined for students, and check for understanding completed in order to ensure students has made the academic mastery of working towards improvement. By the end of 2022, 51% students in grade (identify grade 3,4,5) will show proficiency in ELA. This will be monitored in weekly data chats with grade groups. It will also be monitored by teachers who can track data with students in order to show needs and improvement.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, K-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassandra Fess (cassandra.fess@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensuring small groups are fluid for each class and for each standard or target being taught. Data on I ready and Performance Matters utilized in order to determine groups so that students can be monitored for appropriate improvement. Ensuring teachers are collaboratively planning each week in every subject area so that lessons can be designed to meet student needs, plan for remediation discussed, as well as looking at what is acceptable for exemplar student work.

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.

We will focus on building positive culture by rewarding students who show positive behavior throughout the school. There have been some difficult students within fifth grade that need extra attention relating to the specific skills that are lacking. Focusing on the positive they can strive for so that positive behaviors recognized in order to diminish negative behaviors.

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.

WBE is a PBIS Model School and takes pride in the work it does to support a positive school culture and climate. All staff are trained and involved in the PBIS and CHAMPS models that are used to promote this positive environment. We use a token economy (Mariner Dollars and Conch Coins) that students and classes can earn and cash in for rewards and incentives both within the classroom and school wide. Students who do not respond appropriately to this intervention are then looked at a Tier 2 level to provide extra support for them to be successful. Data is monitored on a monthly basis and decisions are made to better support certain students or grade levels that are showing high numbers of referrals and OSS.

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

Administration- Leads the PBIS Campaign

Teachers & Staff- Are trained and implement the PBIS and CHAMPS expectations school wide.

Students- Participate in token economy

Community- Provides incentives and rewards for students

Parents- Work with their students at home to promote the CHAMPS expectations of WBE.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00