White City Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

White City Elementary School

905 W 2ND ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34982

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

Demographics

Principal: Alexandra Laoutas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
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 (41%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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

White City Elementary School

905 W 2ND ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34982

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

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	83%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

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 White City Elementary is to collaborate as a learning organization while engaging the minds of our students every day through quality work. All students will develop to their fullest potential, respect themselves and others, and acquire a love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

White City Elementary School, in partnership with parents and community members, will become a premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. White City Elementary School's name is synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our promise is to focus on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging, and satisfying work for every student, every day. This is the Wildcat way!

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
Laoutas, Alexandra	Principal	Alexandra Laoutas- The principal provides a shared vision for the use of data-based decision–making; models the problem-solving process; supervises the implementation of a strong core instructional program. Ensures the implementation of SingleSchool Culture, SEL curriculum, and collaborative planning to monitor achievement, behavior, and attendance. The principal will support teachers and staff regarding data analysis and the use of data to drive instruction. The Principal also leads SAC and the faculty Council for continuous school improvement.
Gieseler, Lauren	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the shared vision for the use ofdata-based decision–making; models the problem-solving process; supervises the implementation of a strong core instructional program. Ensures the implementation of Single School Culture, SEL curriculum, and collaborative planning to monitor achievement, behavior, and attendance. The assistant principal will support teachers and staff regarding data analysis and the use of data to drive instruction. The assistant principal also leads new teacher induction programs, safety protocols, andmanage testing across the campus
Trabal, Ciara	Math Coach	Ciara Trabal (Math Coach): Responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring, and collaborating to promote a quality mathematics curriculum for students. Roles and responsibilities include: Assist school-based administrators and teachers in analyzing school, class, and individual student data to determine needs to improve mathematics. Assist content area teachers in planning instruction and formative assessments based on the standards and targets, using district pacing calendars and instructional strategies and materials effectively, and using data from formative assessments and district unit assessments to improve instruction. – Support teachers in collaborative planning for instruction to meet the needs of all students through differentiated instruction. - Provide classroom support by observing, modeling, co-teaching, and providing specific feedback. Provide follow-up support for professionaldevelopment for mathematics.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Alexandra Laoutas

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

483

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

11

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

12

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	79	83	80	74	103	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	50	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	51	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	0	32	53	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	77	93	73	108	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
Attendance below 90 percent	7	31	37	22	56	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	1	2	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	79	77	93	73	108	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
Attendance below 90 percent	7	31	37	22	56	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	1	2	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				32%	50%	57%	34%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	55%	58%	55%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	54%	53%	71%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				40%	53%	63%	57%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				44%	50%	62%	62%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	42%	51%	49%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				35%	46%	53%	59%	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	29%	50%	-21%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	48%	-18%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	26%	47%	-21%	60%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	46%	-11%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for K-8 was iReady Diagnostics. Science progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	8	15
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	6	15
	Students With Disabilities	14	14	14
	English Language Learners	25	10	20
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	14	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	13	15
	Students With Disabilities	43	14	14
	English Language Learners	30	25	25

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	16	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	16	25
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	7	4	17
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	12	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	13	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	3

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	49	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	47	44
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	20
	English Language Learners	23	20	29
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	75	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	77	68
	Students With Disabilities	0	60	40
	English Language Learners	25	69	60

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	40	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	33	54
	Students With Disabilities	27	20	44
	English Language Learners	18	19	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	61	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	58	73
	Students With Disabilities	27	50	60
	English Language Learners	38	54	60

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	41	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	37	25
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	0
	English Language Learners	9	13	21
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	52	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	52	45
	Students With Disabilities	13	20	30
	English Language Learners	32	38	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	29	39	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	34	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	50
	English Language Learners	11	22	38

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	5	27			8						
ELL	24	36	55	28	26	33	27				
BLK	16	40	60	21	23		15				
HSP	30	31		33	25	40	32				
WHT	26	15		21	14		29				
FRL	22	33	47	24	24	35	20				
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	3	28	31	20	55	56					
ELL	29	49	45	42	47	50	19				
BLK	26	38	37	34	44	41	39				
HSP	35	60	64	46	43		29				
WHT	40	48		42	48		30				
FRL	31	46	41	39	42	42	34				
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	14	56	67	20	41	37	36				
ELL	24	53	69	63	60	64	65				
BLK	30	58	70	50	64	57	42				
HSP	36	54	80	70	67	53	65				
WHT	37	55		45	47	20	75				
FRL	34	55	70	57	62	47	59				

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	262
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	10
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
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	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	
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	21
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

Math learning gains had the biggest decline from previous years.

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

Math proficiency and learning gains demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Teacher turnover, virtual learning, and fifth-grade teacher content knowledge and experience were contributing factors to the decline in math proficiency and learning gains. Actions to address improvement include teacher professional development to deepen their content knowledge of each unit.

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

ELA learning gains increased by 4% from the 2019 state assessment.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement were increased emphasis on the writing process, structured text marking, and intentional small group instruction implementation for ELA lowest 20%.

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

Walk to intervention utilizing LLI, small group writing instruction, and school-wide fluency instruction will be needed to accelerate student learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities provided to teachers include math content modules, collaborative learning and planning CLP, and Instructional Rounds. Math teachers will view district-created content modules before planning for a new unit. Ongoing PLC with all teachers to improve the lesson planning process, including monitoring student's work. Classrooms teachers will receive PD on instructional rounds to observe the implementation of high yield strategies from colleagues.

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

There will be a focus on adult SEL and build a productive coll climate in order to decrease teacher turnover and ensure sustainability next year and beyond.

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 learning gains have seen a drastic decrease from 45% to 22%.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, math learning gains for all subgroups will increase to 50%
Monitoring:	This will be monitored through district-created unit assessments and by monitoring student work during collaborative planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math coach will support rigorous, standards-based planning and delivery of content learning. Common collaborative planning focusing on the standards for grade-level instruction. Focus on school-wide math fluency strategies for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Within grades 3-5, 60 percent of the teachers have less than 3-5 years of teaching experience in their grade level. The math coach will support teachers in planning standards-based instruction will an emphasis on math fluency throughout the year.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor weekly lesson plans- alignment to MAFS and district scope and sequence.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

Meet weekly for collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Ciara Trabal (ciara.trabal@stlucieschools.org)

Plan walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of created lessons.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Coaches and administration will meet with teachers to collaboratively plan rigorous standard-based lessons.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, learning gains of the bottom quartile in ELA will reach 70%
Monitoring:	This will be monitored through district-created unit assessments and by monitoring student work during collaborative planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional coaches will support rigorous collaborative planning. Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) will be used during the additional hour of instruction at White City Elementary. LLI is a small group intervention designed to achieve grade-level proficiency. The intervention provides explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	LLI was chosen as a resource due to explicit, scripted lessons, aligned to student deficits that are designed in order to close the achievement gap for students performing below proficiency at identified grade levels.

Action Steps to Implement

Coach and Admin will facilitate collaborating planning.

Person Responsible	Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)

School-wide implementation of accountable talk

Person Responsible	Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of teacher and student climate results, student discipline data indicate a need to address the social-emotional needs of our school .
Measurable Outcome:	We will see a 20% decrease in office code calls, ODRs/BIRs, and suspensions in the 2021-2022 school year. We see a 20% decrease in the number of students with zero SEL competencies on the spring climate survey data.
Monitoring:	Code calls logs, monthly occurrence reports, and student/ staff climate surveys will be used to monitor fo the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony- Meet up and daily lessons Behavior specialist delivering small group SEL lessons SEL/ PBIS committee Community garden with a behavior specialist Adult SEL activities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students lack the skills needed to manage and regulate their emotions. Those skills must be taught and practiced. Adults also struggle with managing emotions due to highly stressful environments, we must provide opportunities for adults to be part of a healthy school climate.

Action Steps to Implement	
Classroom walkthroughs during community circles.	
Person Responsible	Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)
Professional development on SEL/PBIS	
Person Responsible	Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)
Monitoring of school-wide SEL plan	
Person Responsible	Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@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. 31% of third-grade students scored at or above a level three. 21% of fourth-grade and 24% of fifth-grade students scored at or about a level three on the 2020-2021 assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2022, 51% students in grade (identify grade 3,4,5) will show proficiency in ELA.
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:	Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@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	Alexandra Laoutas (alexandra.laoutas@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible	Lauren Gieseler (lauren.gieseler@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

At White City Elementary the discipline data as compared to the state continues to see a steady decline in offenses, including those at level 3 and level 4. While we see a decline, we recognize the need for continued improvement, specifically in the area of fighting and incidents of battery without serious bodily harm. During the 2021-2022 school year, SEL has been coupled with PBIS to target school-wide behavioral data and within targeted grade groups, and more importantly, to serve students exhibiting need. To further support, all behavioral incidents (BIR) and Office Discipline Referrals (ODR) are monitored weekly and reviewed at monthly Threat Assessment meetings. The meetings include, but are not limited to, school administration, school psychologist, school counselor, and behavioral coach. These meetings are used as a problem-solving/root cause analysis tool for students exhibiting behaviors. Student plans are developed and monitored for effectiveness by tracking discipline data entries.

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.

White City Elementary will host several parent events. Parents, teachers, and community members will be invited to participate in our monthly school advisory council meetings. During the SAC meetings, stakeholders will learn about student achievement goals and our school improvement plan. The SAC will oversee the budget and monitor school improvement targets as we support the needs of our students. FSA parent night will be held to deepen parent's understanding of the FSA. WE will celebrate literacy week. These events may be held virtually based on COVID-19 safety protocals. The CHildrens Service Council of St. Lucie has also adopted WCE to help support literacy and family involvement.

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

Teachers will promote a positive school culture by focusing on daily SEL lessons. Families will support their children by being involved in school activities. Business/ community partners will help promote a positive culture by donating their time and resources to students.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00