St. Lucie West K 8 School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Lucie West K 8 School

1501 SW CASHMERE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

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

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Lezeau

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (64%)
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	ATSI
* 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 10/11/2022.

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.](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

<div style="background:#2e2e6e;color:white;text-align:center;font-weight:bold;">

St. Lucie West K 8 School

</div>

1501 SW CASHMERE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	67%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lezeau, Joseph	Principal	
Monroe, Lorie	Assistant Principal	
Sexton, Tari	Assistant Principal	
Sutton, Barbara	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Joseph Lezeau

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
79

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,655

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
21

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
18

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	126	119	145	155	161	171	233	228	234	0	0	0	0	1572
Attendance below 90 percent	53	45	40	44	46	52	79	76	86	0	0	0	0	521
One or more suspensions	8	11	17	30	14	31	70	83	57	0	0	0	0	321
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	35	60	88	57	0	0	0	0	267
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	40	24	48	92	75	49	0	0	0	0	0	328
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	6	13	11	10	6	61	69	50	0	0	0	0	226

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	9	15	30	36	48	108	114	79	0	0	0	0	443

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	53%	55%				65%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						60%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						42%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	54%	41%	42%				64%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	65%						59%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						39%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	51%	50%	54%				64%	58%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	55%	59%				72%	74%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	50%	19%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

				ELA		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	72%	48%	24%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2022					
	2019	58%	51%	7%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
07	2022					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	52%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2022					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	68%	55%	13%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	47%	21%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
07	2022					
	2019	61%	50%	11%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	34%	10%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	64%	46%	18%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	59%	48%	11%	48%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	71%	67%	4%	71%	0%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	96%	51%	45%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	11	28	27	20	40	37	13	36			
ELL	32	38	37	38	56	46	28	48	82		
ASN	63	42		81	83						
BLK	47	48	31	43	62	61	49	56	83		
HSP	47	47	46	54	65	59	46	53	83		
MUL	56	53	50	61	73	50	57				
WHT	57	57	43	63	66	66	55	65	95		
FRL	44	49	36	46	63	60	44	53	83		

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	25	39	33	25	40	39	24	25			
ELL	37	45	32	36	40	43	32	43			
ASN	75	69		94	77						
BLK	48	51	53	37	40	31	41	48	71		
HSP	51	50	34	50	40	41	60	62	79		
MUL	55	38	10	56	35		59	42			
WHT	64	57	37	58	50	50	70	58	90		
FRL	49	46	37	43	41	40	50	55	83		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	37	28	25	32	19	10	16			
ELL	42	46	30	47	49	34	41	53			
ASN	82	75		82	88						
BLK	55	55	36	47	50	34	54	70	94		
HSP	69	60	42	70	60	42	64	71	96		
MUL	58	55		50	37	9	23				
WHT	70	62	49	72	64	45	75	75	98		
FRL	60	56	40	58	57	35	58	66	95		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Based on the 21-22 results, Science achievement decreased in both 5th and 8th grades and ELA decreased by 4% point in grades 3-8 within the identified subgroup except, Asian students. The decline in scores are attributed to the lack of fluency which impacts the application of comprehension.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 21-22 results, students in grades 3-8 dropped 4% in ELA proficiency in ELL and SWD subgroups. Based on the 21-22 results, students in grades 5 and 8 dropped 8% in science proficiency.

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

In reflecting on some of the contributing factors leading to our need for improvement, we found that we have a lack of certified ELA teachers. Additionally, we noticed that there were not as many hands-on experiments being completed to support the science instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 21-22 results, students in grades 3-8 demonstrated significant growth in Math Learning Gains and Math bottom quartile across all subgroups, expect Students that are identified as SWD. In addition to the Acceleration increased by 82% to 87%.

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

The increase in the amount of time for instruction for students in these courses. For example, a double block (90 minutes) for all algebra and geometry students. Additionally, lessons were aligned to the standards and regular checks for understanding to ensure standards-based instruction.

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

To accelerate learning for all students, SLWK8 will structure the focus on Standards-based instruction to facilitate rigorous lessons to meet the full intent of the grade level standards coupled with the following evidence-based strategies:
Tier 1 professional development and support
Tier 2/3 Support for K-8
Before and afterschool tutoring
Collaborative Planning - two or more times per week
Weekly Learning Communities
PBIS
iSucceed

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 learning is an on-going process to develop instructional pedagogy to support the teachers and learners by focusing on strategies to increase engagement and the quality of student work coupled with following:
Small group instruction (ELA)
Interactive Notebooks (All grades/subjects)
Thinking Maps(All grades/subjects)
Collaborative Planning for all new teachers
Cooperative Learning Strategies (All grades/subjects)
Penda (Science)
iReady

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

As part of the implementation of increase student learning, these are our planned strategies to for improvement:

Before and afterschool tutoring
Tier 2 intervention for grades K-8
Tier 3 intervention for identified students

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The data shows that last year we had a drop of 8% in overall Science proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, our science proficiency will increase to at least 55%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The use of district-created assessments, aligned to the state SSA standards, will allow us to progress monitor our 5th and 8th grade students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collaborative planning with the use of our Framework for Quality Teaching and Learning, will provide the structure for rigorous lesson plans and the monitoring of the delivery of those lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	When teachers effectively plan with evidence-based strategies, there is a higher likelihood of rigorous delivery of those rigorous lesson plans.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administration will be a part of the weekly Collaborative planning to guide and monitor lesson planning and data analysis.

Person Responsible	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

Data chats will be held after district-based unit assessments with administration to analyze the results and action plan for next steps.

Person Responsible	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

Both 5th and 8th grade students will complete standards-based lessons through Penda on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our data shows ELA Proficiency dropped from 55% to 51%, a 4% drop.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By the end of 2022-2023 school year, our ELA proficiency will increase to at least 54%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The use of district-created assessments, aligned to the state BEST standards, will allow us to progress monitor students growth in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barbara Sutton (barbara.sutton@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collaborative planning with the use of our Framework for Quality Teaching and Learning will provide the structure for rigorous lesson plans and the monitoring of the delivery of those lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	When teachers effectively plan with evidence-based strategies, there is a higher likelihood of rigorous delivery of those lesson plans.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The literacy coach along with admin will be planning regularly with grade groups to ensure standards-based planning with rigor as the focus.

Person Responsible	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

Small group instruction will be required in all ELA classes daily.

Person Responsible	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

Data chats will be held after district-based unit assessments with administration to analyze the results and action plan for next steps.

Person Responsible	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

Our reading interventionists will be providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for identified students.

Person Responsible	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Literacy performance decreased across several subgroups. Based on the data, we have identified and strategically targeted these students to provide them with intense, remedial instruction to supplement their Tier I curriculum. This targeted instruction can hep to narrow the gap they have and move towards learning gains and ultimately proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students within the identified subgroups below the 41% (SWD) on our ESSA data will increase overall performance by 3%. We anticipate seeing an overall increase in this performance area.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Collaborative planning time will be scheduled. Teachers will use CLPs to discuss Unique and IReady data as well as district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students will be provided small group remediation for skills not mastered as identified through progress monitoring. Groups will be fluid and flexible.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Small group instruction allows students to be given specific instruction on skills not yet mastered.

Action Steps to Implement	
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.	

Teachers of students with disabilities will be actively involved in collaborative planning with general education grade groups and Support Facilitator.

Person Responsible	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Teachers will monitor assessment data to determine areas that students are still showing gaps in and formulate a plan for closing that achievement gap.

Person Responsible	Joseph Lezeau (joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org)

Reading interventionists will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction on a weekly basis and monitor that progress.

Person Responsible	Lorie Monroe (lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Tier 2 and 3 intervention for applicable students
Small Group instruction with differentiation

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Tier 2 and 3 intervention for applicable students
Small Group instruction with differentiation

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our goal is to decrease the number of Level 1 3rd grade students by 5% points or less (from 53% to 48%)

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Through FAST/STAR and Unit assements, we plan to monitor progress and share data with students so they can create personal goals .

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sutton, Barbara, barbara.sutton@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Literacy Routines
90 minute uninterrupted block
Hegerty
LLI
Savas
Small group with differentiation (daily)
Tier 2 Intervention which include LLI and Reading Horizons
Tier 3 Intervention which include Fundations and Story Champs

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All practice/programs have been district-approved and are evidenced-based. We strategically use them based on students' needs.

Literacy Routines
90 minute uninterrupted block

Hegerty
LLI
Savas
Small group with differentiation (daily)
Tier 2 Intervention which include LLI and Reading Horizons
Tier 3 Intervention which include Fundations and Story Champs

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership Team will meet every month to plan and review ELA needs in grade K-8.	Sutton, Barbara, barbara.sutton@stlucieschools.org
Literacy Coaching	Sutton, Barbara, barbara.sutton@stlucieschools.org
FAST/STAR Assessments	Monroe, Lorie, lorie.monroe@stlucieschools.org
Professional Learning	Lezeau, Joseph, joseph.lezeau@stlucieschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our PBIS Core members will meet twice a month to plan and review discipline data. All teachers/staff will provide "Shark Bucks" to students who follow expectations. As an additionally component, SLWK8 has implemented a Single School Culture around areas that were identified by the stakeholders that needed to be normed school-wide.

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

Principal Joseph Lezeau
AP Lorie Monroe
AP Tari Sexton
AP Barbara Sutton
Dean Stefanie DeVries
Dean Maurice Smith
PBIC Core Team