

St. Lucie Public Schools

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy The W.E.S.T. PREP



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy The W.E.S.T. PREP Magnet

1801 PANTHER LN, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

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

Demographics

Principal: David Alfonso

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	79%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (48%)
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.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy The W.E.S.T. PREP Magnet

1801 PANTHER LN, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

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

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)
High School 9-12	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

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.

Fort Pierce Westwood will become the premier educational center in St. Lucie County.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fort Pierce Westwood High School utilizes a holistic approach to meeting the individual needs of our students. This concept focuses on a student-centered approach to teaching and learning. We are rooted in standards based instruction to promote a conducive environment that uses informed decision-making processes coupled with data to drive the instructional planning to increase student learning. We strive to equip our students with the skills and intelligence in becoming contributing members in the community.

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
Green, Megan	Principal	Dr. Green oversees all school-wide systems and campus operations. She is the lead for the master schedule and data assessment. She also oversees staff PD, and recruitment and retention. She approves budgeting, purchasing and payroll. She is the main contact for community outreach and business partnerships. Dr. Green oversees academic coaches, interventionists, the graduation coach and teachers on special assignment. She also heads faculty council the school advisory council (SAC).
Rampone, Brittany	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. Her duties include oversight of the CTE programs, Magnet implementation and monitoring, Recruitment schedules, 10th grade student body, the oversight of Assessment, Title I, oversight of Exceptional Student Education, and student incentives.
Woltjen, Fred	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include oversight over the Marine Oceanographic Academy (MOA), the MOA student body, Student Services and Curriculum, Master scheduling, ESOL compliance, the oversight of school counselors and the guidance clerk, Discipline at MOA and data assessment.
Smith, Nicole	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. Her main duties include oversight of Facilities and Activities, Discipline and Deans, Fine Arts, the 12th-grade student body, the Math department, attendance, field trip requests, PBIS, and NEST.
Kennedy, Alicia	Assistant Principal	Her main duties include the 9th grade student body, Foreign Language and Science departments, Activities and clubs, School safety (including drills and searches), MTSS oversight, Credit recovery and Recruitment.
Robinson, Eddie	Assistant Principal	One of five Assistant Principals. His main duties include the 11th grade student body, Technology and laptops, Transportation, JROTC, Student incentives, PTO, Instructional Materials, and the Reading and Social Studies department.
Miller, Monica	School Counselor	Guidance Director
Eliassaint, Fedna	Attendance/ Social Work	School-based Social Worker
Roti, Mary	Other	
Benton, Rebecca		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/15/2022, David Alfonso

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.*

0

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

113

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,124

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

25

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

26

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539	517	463	392	1911
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312	349	333	254	1248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	124	72	38	365
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	159	143	29	525
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	102	103	55	358
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215	221	106	61	603
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	218	153	51	518
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256	248	194	43	741

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	11	10	40

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/18/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537	496	461	348	1842
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308	272	287	211	1078
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	57	30	22	192
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	229	105	25	523
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	100	140	53	396
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	158	99	44	509
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	173	133	24	471
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	266	212	1	721

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	343	317	274	103	1037

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	16	16	12	21	65

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537	496	461	348	1842
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308	272	287	211	1078
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	57	30	22	192
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	229	105	25	523
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	100	140	53	396
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	158	99	44	509
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	173	133	24	471
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	266	212	1	721

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	343	317	274	103	1037

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16	12	21	65

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	33%	46%	51%				41%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	38%						39%	48%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	24%						21%	36%	42%
Math Achievement	22%	37%	38%				27%	40%	51%
Math Learning Gains	40%						26%	41%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						26%	38%	45%
Science Achievement	39%	29%	40%				63%	71%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	41%	43%	48%				52%	68%	73%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	60%	71%	-11%	67%	-7%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	49%	68%	-19%	70%	-21%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	16%	51%	-35%	61%	-45%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	32%	55%	-23%	57%	-25%

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	14	26	17	9	40	48	19	19		98	35
ELL	14	32	24	11	34	41	22	9		98	35
BLK	21	36	27	12	35	39	27	31		97	49
HSP	37	36	16	27	42	52	40	46		95	62
MUL	30	32		23			45				
WHT	55	46	27	48	48		65	70		94	84
FRL	27	38	28	18	39	42	35	35		97	54
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	14	15	13	15	23	24	37	37		93	35
ELL	8	25	28	7	21	31	18	5		95	48
BLK	25	29	20	10	23	30	42	27		97	60
HSP	40	37	23	17	20	30	65	42		95	64
MUL	19	29		30						100	62
WHT	64	57		42	31	15	85	83		94	95
FRL	32	34	22	13	22	27	50	38		96	65
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	12	19	13	19	26	27	33	38		86	40
ELL	9	25	26	12	18	17	33	15		85	62
BLK	25	29	21	16	19	20	47	40		91	59
HSP	47	46	16	29	30	30	64	53		89	66
MUL	67	50		25	8		83	50		100	73
WHT	73	55		62	43		93	86		96	84
FRL	30	31	22	23	26	22	52	45		93	65

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	33
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

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	60
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Over the last two years, in both subgroups of students with disabilities and English Language Learners, the data supports an increase in ELA achievement and ELA learning gains. Additionally, for the 2021-2022 school year, black students have increased in the areas of ELA learning gains and achievement. In math, students with disabilities, students who are English Language Learners and black and Hispanic students all increased in math learning gains and achievement. Based on the data from the 2021-2022 school year, white students have decreased in ELA and math achievement, and ELA learning gains.

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

While a large increase in learning gains and achievement in math was evidenced, we had 29.1% more students earn a level 1 (inadequate) compared to other high schools in the district. Compared to the state, we have 35.4% more students who earned a level 1. Compared to the district and state, we had approximately 17.5% less students who earned a level 3 (satisfactory score) on their math state assessments for the 2021-2022 school year. As compared to the district and state, we had only 5% of students score a level 4 or 5 (proficient/mastery) on their math assessments compared to an approximate 20% of district schools and 27% compared to the state.

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

Based on assessment scores that are below both the district and state, Fort Pierce Westwood data indicates that students are scoring significantly lower (level 1: inadequate) than their peers statewide. A continuation of the procedures and practices that were put into place last school year will occur in an effort to increase teacher capacity in their content area. For example, an intentional plan to continue targeted instruction with a focus on standard-based instruction. Additionally, Fort Pierce Westwood will develop and implement a plan focused on a cultural shift where students feel empowered to be a part of their school community and will be encouraged by the adults who support them. At Fort Pierce Westwood, our plan will target the whole child for both academic and life success.

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

As a school, math learning gains increased 16% from the previous school year. In addition, math for the bottom 25% of students grew by 16%. The most dramatic increase was for Hispanic students who increased by 22% for math learning gains and those in the bottom 25%. Black students achieved an 7% increase in ELA learning gains and performance of the bottom 25%.

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

At Fort Pierce Westwood, the team was intentional with the planning of interventions for students. Based on assessment data, we identified students who were likely to make learning gains and students that were close to proficiency. Interventions were presented to student and are called "VIP" so that students felt empowered by the process. Student conference were held where staff and students set and monitored their goals. The students that were involved felt that they were an integral part in increasing our scores and saw the importance behind a collective team effort. The VIP students participated in targeted instruction two times per week, with an intense focus on the standards. We also increased the rigor of our instruction within the classroom with intentional collaborative planning focused on the standards.

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

We will need to continue to support the collaborative planning process throughout the year. Teachers will use exemplars in the planning process along with the intentional planning of/for the use of high-effect size strategies. Additionally, we will focus on restorative justice practices as it relates to discipline with the goal that increasing student awareness through empowerment instead of punishment will result in a better learning environment.

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.

A continuation of Single School Culture training and implementation, as well as Leader in Me and STEAM development. The school will also continue to provide professional development through the year in the collaborative planning cycle. Fort Pierce Westwood staff will also be trained within equity for all, restorative practice and educating students in poverty.

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

Two Teachers on Special Assignments (TSA) positions have been added to the school. One will focus on supporting the MTSS process. She will support teachers in identifying students' areas for growth and

will develop tools for use to increase students' skills. She will also identify students who need intense support and provide strategic interventions in the area of need. The second TSA will work primarily with 9th & 10th grade teachers in supporting academic, behavioral and attendance needs to assure all students are on track to meet graduation requirements.

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 Collaborative Planning

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:
Include a rationale
that explains how it
was identified as a
critical need from the
data reviewed.**

FPWA hired 28 positions this year that are directly linked to school grade acquisition ranging from classroom teachers to paraprofessionals. Many are experienced educators from other districts and we will need to onboard them with our practices, paradigms and principles. The collaborative planning process focuses on standards aligned instruction coupled with research driven, deliberate and engaging lessons for our students. The rationale is when there is a highly effective process rich with protocols in place, the result will be an increase in all of our tested subject area state test scores leading to an improvement in the school grade.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific
measurable outcome
the school plans to
achieve. This should
be a data based,
objective outcome.**

Specific changes in the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and behaviors we expect to occur as a result of our area of focus include an increase in teacher and student efficacy, a strong alignment between standards and collaboratively planned instruction as well as a high level of active engagement in class from students.

Baseline data collected from state assessments in 2019, 2021 and 2023 will be used as a measure of growth for standards aligned instruction with each unit assessment this year.

The synergy generated from collaborative planning groups leads to a strengthened sense of confidence when teaching the students and an improved efficacy around the expected improvements. In addition student and teacher attendance rates will be used to gauge eagerness to attend school and engage in daily instruction.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this
Area of Focus will be
monitored for the
desired outcome.**

This area of focus will be monitored by Administration through CLP observations and participation as well as unit assessment results. Weekly CLP meetings for each of the content areas, specifically tested subjects, are attended by supervising Administration and the Principal as a collaborator, observer and oversight. Administration and members of the Leadership team will observe planned lessons and monitor for effective delivery. Actionable feedback will be provided often and monitored for implementation through classroom observations and at the CLP table. The progress in areas of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, African-American and multi-racial students , and Economically Disadvantaged students will be monitored through unit

assessments and teacher generated assessments. Students needing additional assistance will be referred to attend our after school "8th period" for tutoring and additional support. After school programming will use tracking sheets to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Green (megan.green@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative lesson planning with the use of protocols is the evidence based strategy implemented for this area of focus. CLPs further focus on the breakdown of standards, alignment of evidenced based teaching strategies, common assessments, student exemplar analysis, and a data cycle to monitor progress and guide remediation and reteaching.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

There is a considerable amount of research to support the effectiveness of CLP practices. The research results are strengthened by the use of protocols that promote student work analysis and collaborative iteration of expectations and tasks assigned. The CLP practice is deeply entrenched in data based decision making around classroom, school, district and state data sources around student assessments.

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 master schedule supports teachers who teach the same or similar subjects to have the same planning time.

Person Responsible Megan Green (megan.green@stlucieschools.org)

The Principal and Assistant Principals attend CLPs weekly to observe, collaborate and monitor the process. This is protected time in the school duty and supervision schedule.

Person Responsible Megan Green (megan.green@stlucieschools.org)

Administration and Team leaders lead data chats with CLPs around expected and actual results post collaboratively planned instruction.

Person Responsible Megan Green (megan.green@stlucieschools.org)

Professional learning in CLPs around evidence based instructional strategies with high effect sizes to build robust toolkits.

Person Responsible Megan Green (megan.green@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Restorative Practices

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Last year Fort Pierce Westwood had a total of 808 infractions. Of the 808, 366 incidents were identified as level 1 offenses, 279 were level 2, 144 were level 3 and 19 were level 4.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

There will be a 15% reduction in the number of referrals (all levels). There will be an increase in the percentage of students who receive mentorship, opportunities for mediation and restorative practice activities.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administration/deans will monitor referrals through PowerBi and Skyward. Student-based focus groups will discuss observational data throughout campus and then problem-solve with administration about ways to increase student adherence to school expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Green (megan.green@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The Leader in Me curriculum and restorative practices/strategies are structured practices that will be used to achieve this area of focus. The district will provide trainings to the Deans, who will then train our students and teachers. Students will be empowered through Leader in Me and conflict resolution with peers and adults, and will pass along their knowledge and experiences to others. In doing so, we aim to decrease undesirable behaviors, create a more cohesive and relationship-focused campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Restorative practices offer schools an alternative to traditional disciplinary actions that center on punishment for misbehavior and breaking rules. These punishments push kids—disproportionately students of color and low-income students—out of their classroom and school community. They may be suspended or simply sent to the principal’s office, but students who are pushed out may drop out of school altogether.

In contrast, restorative practices focus on resolving conflict, repairing harm, and healing relationships. They support a positive and safe school climate, prevent bullying, and reduce disciplinary incidents. A restorative culture can mitigate the negative effects of punitive discipline policies that exacerbate inequity.

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.

All school-based leadership team members will have a focus group of students who they will meet with monthly. The identified focus groups students are those who have been strategically identified by discipline rates, campus influence, etc. Leadership's goals within the focus groups are to work with students to identify and define expectations. Students will have opportunities to provide input on their wants and needs, and leadership can refine student input to meet campus wide expectations. This process will build community, make students feel hear, and be a win:win.

Person Responsible Brittany Rampone (brittany.rampone@stlucieschools.org)

When rules or expectations are broken, students will participate in mediation instead of typical "punishments."

Person Responsible Nicole Smith (nicole.smith@stlucieschools.org)

Targeted training in the area of restorative practice for all staff.

Person Responsible Brittany Rampone (brittany.rampone@stlucieschools.org)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy plans on utilizing multiple facets of mass communication through SLPS's school messenger, Skyward Parent Portal, and our school's social media outlets to increase positive relationships with all stakeholders. Increasing our forms of communication fosters a level of transparency to parents, families, community members that need to be informed about our school. In addition, all stakeholders are invited to partake in our School Advisory Council, as this group's primary function is to evaluate and advise on the progression of the School Improvement Plan. Student families attend our School Advisory Council monthly meetings and offer input in the decision-making process. Home visits occur as an intervention to academics or behavior but they have proven to strengthen the relationship with our families and promote parent involvement.

In addition, we are using Panorama survey results to gauge where improvements to school culture need to be made. From the results of the survey we are engaging the staff in schoolwide training on Equity, Implicit

Bias, Social Emotional Learning, and Franklin-Covey's Leader in Me curriculum. We will engage parents and community members through the 7 Habits of Highly Effective Families. Fort Pierce Westwood Academy earned the PBIS award for being a Model Resilient school in 2020-2021. We will continue to build and implement our PBIS plan in the 2022-2023 school year

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

Administration plays a role in supporting our positive school culture as we model the expectations for the students and staff and lead by that example. One of the tenets of our single school culture is that teachers greet our students at the door every period of each day to foster relationships and that feeling of welcome when students enter their room. PBIS is celebrated weekly with recognition over the announcements for students and staff alike that have been "caught" doing the right thing during the week. The past school year Fort Pierce Westwood Academy was recognized for being a Model resilient school for the first time. We have a student leadership team that develops lessons that align to Franklin-Covey's Leader in Me. These students leaders will lead lessons in classrooms for their fellow students and work to build capacity and expand our student leaders. These student leaders reinforce the student ownership of their learning and the school culture that supports. School Advisory Council (SAC) reflects parents and community member involvement in the school. The beginning of the 2021-2022 school year School Advisory Council (SAC) had the largest group of people in attendance in more than 5 years which reflects the positive culture. This large and diverse group will assist us in supporting our positive school culture and environment.