

St. Lucie Public Schools

Parkway 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Parkway Elementary School

7000 NW SELVITZ RD, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

Demographics

Principal: Latanya Greene

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2020

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)	83%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Parkway Elementary School

7000 NW SELVITZ RD, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

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>73%</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>74%</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.

Our Mission at Parkway Elementary School is to instill the treasures of knowledge, citizenship, and self-esteem in all students. The Parkway family will provide engaging instruction in a safe and caring environment while fostering success and creating lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision at Parkway Elementary, in partnership with parents and community members, is to become a culture of lifelong learners that master challenging content, exceed state standards, and apply critical, independent thinking skills.

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
Greene, LaTanya	Principal	
Mannarino, Kathleen	Other	
Sherman, Justin	School Counselor	
Mann, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	
Lindh, Valerie	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/11/2020, Latanya Greene

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

486

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

12

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

8

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	72	70	75	73	69	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	12	30	31	29	30	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	24	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	41	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	47	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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	62	72	74	74	94	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	468
Attendance below 90 percent	6	19	20	29	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	4	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	62	72	74	74	94	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	468
Attendance below 90 percent	6	19	20	29	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	4	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	25	55	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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				44%	50%	57%	45%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	55%	58%	48%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	54%	53%	50%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				37%	53%	63%	48%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				38%	50%	62%	66%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27%	42%	51%	53%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	46%	53%	39%	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	44%	50%	-6%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	51%	-11%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	48%	-4%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	32%	54%	-22%	64%	-32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	46%	-1%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for K-5 was iReady Diagnostics.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	23	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	25	38
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	25
	English Language Learners	11	19	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	14	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	16	38
	Students With Disabilities	9	9	56
	English Language Learners	11	10	29

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	73	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	71	80
	Students With Disabilities	36	42	60
	English Language Learners	65	72	77
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65	78	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	64	77	82
	Students With Disabilities	46	50	64
	English Language Learners	47	64	88

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66	76	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	73	72
	Students With Disabilities	23	39	43
	English Language Learners	13	25	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70	84	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	81	78
	Students With Disabilities	39	67	64
	English Language Learners	25	75	56

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	60	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	62	69
	Students With Disabilities	25	45	58
	English Language Learners	20	25	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58	68	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	67	67
	Students With Disabilities	35	55	75
	English Language Learners	27	31	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	53	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	21	18	18
	English Language Learners	17	25	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60	68	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	61	64	50
	Students With Disabilities	26	33	18
	English Language Learners	42	50	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42	45	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	36	42
	Students With Disabilities	21	5	19
	English Language Learners	36	8	25
	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	10	20	17	12	40	36	17				
ELL	23	42		25	63		25				
BLK	26	42		27	43		15				
HSP	29	27		30	46		38				
MUL	50			30							
WHT	44	50		48	60		67				
FRL	30	37	20	33	49	31	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	11	31	33	9	22	29	27				
ELL	40	58		34	40	40	43				
BLK	38	54	38	27	31	21	52				
HSP	50	61	38	42	38	24	56				
MUL	36			27							
WHT	39	45	56	39	38	45	37				
FRL	42	50	35	36	36	23	52				
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	15	26	29	17	52	50	12				
ELL	46	69	58	41	70	75					
BLK	38	33		32	53	45	20				
HSP	47	63	58	45	67	60	43				
MUL	50			25							
WHT	43	47	67	63	75	50	48				
FRL	42	50	47	46	64	51	40				

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	35
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	28
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	282

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	34
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	30
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
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	33
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?

The trend data indicates a consistent drop in proficiency for ELA and Math scores. Although we saw an increase with bottom quartile students and students who made learning gain in math, there still a gap in student learning and instructional practice.

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

ELA and Science are the areas that 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?

COVID Protocol, Virtual vs Traditional school setting, Minimal face-to-face meetings, Teacher turnover during middle of the year, lost of the Literacy Coach mid year, etc...

Focus on CLPs...inspect what we expect
Ensure instructional practice is rigorous, engaging, and aligned to the standards

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

From 2019 to 2021 math learning Gains increased from 38% to 53% and math bottom quartile increased from 27% to 32%.

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

Contributing factors included an hour and a half for math block, small group instruction, CLPs monitored daily & provided feedback as needed. Administration and coaches monitored instruction & CFUs to ensure lessons were rigorous and CFUs were aligned to the standards and simulated FSA. District level support was also a factor as they assisted with monitoring the math routines, CLPs and sharing constructive feedback.

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

Following the CLP protocol during planning time.
Fidelity walks in all content areas.
Feedback to teachers in a timely manner.
Coach support for teachers.
Interventionists support for students in Tiered 2 and 3.
Laser focus data chat meetings.
Modeling in classrooms
Focus on bottom quartile students

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 Protocol...Get Better Faster
LLI
IReady
Content specific PD
Facilitator Modules
Thinking Maps
Science Support

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

Support from district support staff to model in rooms and assist in CLPSs.
Administration will attend all CLP meetings
New ELA Curriculum (Benchmark Advanced)
Model Classrooms

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with strong social-emotional skills are better able to cope with everyday challenges and benefit academically and socially. Social and emotional competency lead to positive and long-term impact on student outcomes both in and out of school. The five SEL competencies of self-awareness, social awareness, relationship skills, responsible decision making, and self-management are vital for school, work, and life success. In the spring of 2021, only 58% of students responded favorably of their perceptions of the overall social and learning climate of the school. This was below the district average and near the 30th percentile nationwide. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and extended time away from traditional school, we recognize there is an increased need for social-emotional connectedness and skill development in our youth. Now more than ever, a focus on SEL in school is critical for long term student success.

Measurable Outcome: Teacher perception of student behavioral concerns as measured by the district teacher climate survey will decrease by 10% or more. Student perception of school climate will increase by 10% or more as measured by the Panorama student survey. Parkway will qualify for PBIS model school status

Monitoring: Sanford Harmony fidelity checks by school based leadership team and district SEL team. Spring and Fall Student Panorama Survey. Spring and Fall Teacher Climate Survey. SEL Committee, PBIS Committee, School Climate Committee.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) reports that the utilization of Sanford Harmony leads to improved academic performance, reduced conduct problems, and improved SEL skills and attitudes. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walkthrough tools. An SEL committee will be established to promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities. District developed Sanford Harmony resources will be utilized in all classrooms to facilitate high quality implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

A protected block of the day will be built in to the master schedule focused on direct instruction and practice in social skills, conflict resolution, and other social-emotional domains. With support from the SLPS SEL Department, teachers and staff will implement the Sanford Harmony program school wide and follow a district developed scope and sequence for daily lessons and activities.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

Pre-school training for all staff on Single School Culture, Intensive SEL and Mental Health Supports, Sanford Harmony, SEL school plan, PBIS, CHAMPS, and ClassDojo student positive feedback system.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor SEL data (behavior, attendance, clinic visits, grades, etc.) using PowerBi, ClassDojo, Panorama, student/staff surveys.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

Frequent feedback and monitoring for fidelity. School leadership team will conduct frequent walk-throughs to verify implementation of initiatives. The focus will be on providing actionable feedback with meaningful follow-up and opportunities for additional training if necessary.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

Development of SEL team, School Climate Committee, and PBIS team to develop capacity and facilitate school-wide efforts.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

Provide a full continuum of mental health supports for students and families. We have a full-time guidance counselor, and a dedicated school social worker, school psychologist, and behavior analyst. These mental health professionals provide staff training, classroom lessons, targeted small groups, individual counseling, parent education, and referrals to outside agencies.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

Collaborate with Dr. Alison Adler to study and develop and Single School Culture focused on shared norms school wide that will positively impact school culture, behavior, and environment.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If the instructional practice improves, all students will have access to high quality learning experiences. By targeting reading proficiency, we will increase overall achievement in all subject areas. This will naturally decrease the number of students needing additional supports through Tier 2 and Tier 3.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency in ELA from 34% to 50% and Learning Gains from 38% to 60%. Increase proficiency in Math from 36% to 50% and Learning Gains from 53% to 64%. Increase proficiency in Science from 40% to 53%.
Monitoring:	i-Ready diagnostics, BAS and district unit assessments will be used in addition to Literacy Walks to monitor student performance and instructional practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Parkway Elementary will continue to build teacher efficacy and provide multiple opportunities for professional growth and collaboration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective teacher efficacy has a mean effect size of 1.57, outweighing other negative factors. By planning collaboratively, with the support of school leadership, to deliver quality standards-based instruction, collective teacher efficacy at Parkway will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

In weekly data chats we will analyze all students' data to specifically inform instruction. An emphasis will be placed on students who are in the bottom quartile, approaching proficiency, Tier 2 and Tier 3 and students who are in danger of dropping out of proficiency.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor data for students who are ESE and ELL. In addition to the bottom quartile students, ESE and ELL student data will be monitored to ensure academic growth. Additional resources and support (e.g., tiered intervention, differentiated instruction, PSTs) will be utilized to meet the needs of these subgroups.

Person Responsible Justin Sherman (justin.sherman@stlucieschools.org)

Collaborative learning and planning daily for all subject areas will be done with fidelity. By collaboratively planning, each teacher's interest, strength, and background can contribute to lessons. Provide cooperative learning and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible Valerie Lindh (valerie.lindh@stlucieschools.org)

To improve classroom instruction, meaningful, granular, and frequent feedback will be provided. Utilizing best practices on feedback and from Get Better Faster, coaches and administration will provide feedback based on needs identified via classroom walks, observations, and teacher-identified needs. The focus will be on delivering actionable feedback with meaningful follow-up and support.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

Teachers will conference with students using data student data notebooks to promote ownership. Conferences will focus on students' individual goals so they understand their strengths and areas for improvement.

Person Responsible Valerie Lindh (valerie.lindh@stlucieschools.org)

A member of each grade level team will complete the CLP Facilitator Training course on Canvas.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

All teachers will participate in B.E.S.T Standards professional development.

Person Responsible LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

Interventionist will target bottom quartile students for additional supports.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA.
Description and Rationale: 3rd Grade-46%
 4th Grade-18%
 5th Grade-38%

Measurable Outcome: By the end of 2022, 51% students in grades 3,4, and 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: [no one identified]

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 tools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments).

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Justin Sherman (justin.sherman@stlucieschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Valerie Lindh (valerie.lindh@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.

Closing the achievement gap and academic achievement will be addressed through our two primary Areas of Focus. Communication will be vital to the success of our virtual and brick & mortar students. We believe that through clear, consistent, and empathetic communication, we will be able to address the needs and concerns of stakeholders.

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.

Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is a priority at Parkway, with a protected block of the day focused on direct instruction and practice in social skills, conflict resolution, and other social-emotional domains. With support from the SLPS SEL Department, we implement the Sanford Harmony program school wide and follow a district developed scope and sequence for daily lessons and activities. Parkway uses Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school wide to teach expectations, reinforce positive behaviors, and develop a positive classroom and school culture.

Parkway has a VPK program that supports transitioning Kindergarten students. The Kindergarten team utilizes a separate open house time to welcome families and provide school and grade level specific information.

Transition meetings for students graduating from Parkway are coordinated by the school counselor. Students are guided through the process of selecting elective classes at their middle school. Targeted students who meet criteria are provided information sessions regarding magnet schools, feeder programs, or acceleration options.

As a Kids at Hope and goal-focused school, data reflection includes setting goals and helping students envision what they want for their future, including steps needed to achieve long-term goals. All students utilize data binders to track their data throughout their year and set long term and short-term goals. All students participate in student-led conferences where they share their goals and reflect on their data with families, school staff, and invited business or community partners.

Parkway is collaborating with Dr. Alison Adler to study and develop and Single School Culture (dress code, transitions, cafeteria) focused on shared norms school wide that will positively impact school culture, behavior, and environment.

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

Parkway provides a full continuum of mental health supports for students and families. We have a full-time guidance counselor, and a dedicated school social worker, school psychologist, and behavior analyst. These mental health professionals provide staff training, classroom lessons, targeted small groups, individual counseling, parent education, and referrals to outside agencies.

The school counselor and ESE Specialist coordinate transition meetings for students entering with IEPs, 504s, behavior plans, safety plans, ESOL plans, or other special needs.

Additional structures to support positive culture and environment:
 School based PBIS, School Climate, Sunshine, and Social Emotional Learning Committees.
 District support from the Social Emotional Learning Department.
 Consultant support for Single School Culture.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00