

St. Lucie Public Schools

Windmill Point Elementary School



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

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

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

Demographics

Principal: Brie Lamb

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
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: B (54%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: 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	N/A
* 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

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

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

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

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

Windmill Point Elementary promises to nurture a positive school culture and to ensure academic excellence by preparing students for college and career readiness through the fostering of self-confidence, instillation of responsibility, and development of leadership skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Upon entering Windmill Point Elementary, you are met with a warm and inviting environment. When you enter our school, you are welcomed by faculty and staff members. As you walk the halls, you hear the chatter of children excitedly discussing the day's assignments. Glancing around, you notice authentic work that students have chosen to display. It is apparent that students feel secure and comfortable at Windmill Point.

As you continue through Windmill Point, you observe that everyone in the school believes it is important to discover what motivates children. Administration, faculty, and staff work collaboratively to design engaging work for students. Teachers are guided by their grade level scope and sequence and have a clear understanding of what students should know and be able to do. They use data from a variety of assessments, including engagement surveys, to guide instruction for each individual child. Faculty and staff strive to meet high expectations. They are lifelong learners and model this behavior for students. Teachers eagerly implement innovative ideas in their classroom and often share results with colleagues, parents, and community members.

Continuing your journey through our school, you see evidence of parent and community involvement. At Windmill Point Elementary, these citizens serve as partners in educating children. The community volunteers are valuable resources that are utilized to provide rich and authentic learning experiences for children. Administrators, teachers, and staff create opportunities for parental and community involvement to promote student achievement. All of the Windmill Point family is involved in the school decision making process, focusing on every aspect of the child's education.

Windmill Point Elementary is a unique school where everyone works together and supports one another. The ultimate goal is the continuous improvement of students, teachers, staff, and community partners as an integral part of our students' education.

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
Lamb, Brie	Principal	
Reals, Leah	Assistant Principal	
Knab, Heather	Reading Coach	
Black, Lacey	Math Coach	
Mihajlovski, Virginia	Teacher, ESE	
Ackenbrack, Cara-Ann	Teacher, K-12	
Gedke, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	
Hsu, Kristen	School Counselor	
Caballero, Christine	School Counselor	
Jackson, LaKeitha	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/17/2022, Brie Lamb

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Total number of students enrolled at the school

974

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

6

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

12

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	153	139	146	146	139	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	883
Attendance below 90 percent	56	51	42	45	38	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280
One or more suspensions	2	4	0	4	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	27	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	32	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	12	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	1	7	2	34	33	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	4	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

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	123	141	158	158	161	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	889
Attendance below 90 percent	29	30	31	44	45	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	5	0	4	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	29	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	25	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	44	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	36	50	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	17	10	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

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	123	141	158	158	161	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	889
Attendance below 90 percent	29	30	31	44	45	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	5	0	4	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	29	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	25	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	44	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	36	50	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	17	10	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

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	53%	46%	56%				49%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						51%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						56%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	43%	50%				53%	53%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%						50%	50%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						47%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	50%	59%				40%	46%	53%

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	49%	50%	-1%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	73%	55%	18%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	47%	-13%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	46%	-7%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

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	21	50	61	31	61	72	15				
ELL	36	46	39	44	58	56	34				
BLK	45	67	65	40	67	69	24				
HSP	43	54	52	50	60	54	36				
MUL	87	76		87	71						
WHT	67	60	33	70	59	33	56				
FRL	46	60	54	49	60	55	35				

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	9	45	67	23	30	43					
ELL	35	57	64	44	35		20				
BLK	46	63		31	25		28				
HSP	44	51	58	50	36	30	35				
MUL	79			67							
WHT	64	69	92	62	50	54	51				
FRL	49	58	77	45	32	35	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	18	48	53	24	48	55	21				
ELL	33	43	62	53	55	60	22				
BLK	47	52	46	46	46	52	30				
HSP	45	46	58	56	51	40	38				
MUL	52	47		54	50						
WHT	51	55	65	54	52	46	50				
FRL	47	52	59	52	48	44	36				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	
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	55
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	51
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	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	54
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	52
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?

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement (42%). The contributing factor is the lack of ELA proficiency in 5th grade (49%).

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

The data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement is students who are dropping out of proficiency in ELA. Based off of 2022 state assessments 34 students moved from a level 1 or 2 to proficiency (level 3+); however 34 students also drop out of proficiency (level 3+) to a level 1 or 2, so no improvement was actually made.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement is a sole focus on Differentiated instruction for our lower performing students (level 1 and 2) and not differentiating for all students. To address this need for improvement, all student regardless of level need additional Differentiated Instruction.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement are Math Learning Gains at 62% (up from 37% in 2021) and Math Learning Gain in the Bottom Quartile at 55% (up from 41% in 2021).

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

The contributing factors to this improvement include: coaching, modeling, building foundational math skills, and including math during MTSS.

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

To accelerate learning, the following strategies will need to be implemented: Literacy Rounds/walk-throughs, additional small group instruction to Differentiate for all students, and consistent reviewing of data for all students to influence instruction.

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.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders CLPs, Quality Instruction, and RAISE opportunities.

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

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement are coaching, feedback, modeling, and professional development.

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 ELA**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

According to state assessment in both 2021 and 2022, only 53% of students were proficient in ELA, While 34 students increased their achievement level (+3), 34 students also dropped out of proficiency to a level 1 or 2, so no improvement was made. Additionally, 54% of 5th grade students were proficient in 2021 (as 4th grade students) and the cohort (as 5th grade students) was only 49% (-5%) was proficient.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

By June 2023, students will increase ELA Achievement by 3%, earning 56% proficiency, on the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using iReady, state Progress Monitoring, and district tests.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

The evidence-based strategy to being implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning), Differentiated Instruction, and coaching and feedback. Additionally using Benchmark Advance for whole group and small group instruction and LLI for tiered intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Benchmark Advance is our peer-reviewed adopted text book materials for ELA instruction which creates consistency between classrooms and grade levels. Additionally, LLI is a researched based intervention used to provided targeted instruction. Also, coaching will be provided during modeling and CLPs as part of our literacy plan, and our Reading Interventionist will provide tier interventions and monitor all students ELA progress.

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.

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for whole group and small group.

Person Responsible Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching and support in Collaborative Learning and Planning, model for teachers, and provide ELA professional development.

Person Responsible Heather Knab (heather.knab@stlucieschools.org)

Common grade level CLP times for all teachers including ESE, additional CLP meetings after school hours, and ELA professional development.

Person Responsible Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible Cara-Ann Ackenbrack (cara-ann.ackenbrack@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description

and Rationale:

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

With implementing new Math standards and curriculum in all grade levels k-5, it is a critical need to ensure all teachers understand the intent and rigor of the standards, and how to utilize new curriculum to create standards based instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2023, students will increase Math Achievement by 5%, earning 59% proficiency, on the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using iReady, state Progress Monitoring, and district tests.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create rigorous, standards based instruction, review data (Quality Instruction), create differentiated Instruction, and to deep the knowledge of standards and resources with teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The rational for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers (both general education and ESE teachers) to create common lesson plans that are standards based using appropriate resources.

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.

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for whole group and small group.

Person Responsible

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching and support in Collaborative Learning and Planning, model for teachers, and provide Math professional development.

Person Responsible

Lacey Black (lacey.black@stlucieschools.org)

Common grade level CLP times for all teachers including ESE, additional CLP meetings after school hours, and Math professional development.

Person Responsible

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

#3. 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.

Science proficiency has increased minimally over prior years (2019- 40%, 2021- 40%, and 2022- 42%), nor does it parallel ELA Achievement (53%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2023, students will increase proficiency rate by 10%, earning a 52% on Science Achievement.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using district level pre- and post test and district Unit Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is hands on science experiments that are align to standards based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with students by creating opportunities for students to engage in hands on experiments and to deepen the students' understanding and knowledge.

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.

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for whole group and small group.

Person Responsible

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching and support in Collaborative Learning and Planning, model for teachers, and provide Math professional development.

Person Responsible

Lacey Black (lacey.black@stlucieschools.org)

Implement a Science Lab during resource for all students k-5.

Person Responsible

Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@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

40% of students in grades k-2 are 1+ years behind in ELA based on iReady.

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

According to state assessment in both 2021 and 2022, only 53% of students were proficient in ELA, While 34 students increased their achievement level (+3), 34 students also dropped out of proficiency to a level 1 or 2, so no improvement was made. Additionally, 54% of 5th grade students were proficient in 2021 (as 4th grade students) and the cohort (as 5th grade students) was only 49% (-5%) was proficient. At this time 49% of grade 5 students scored a level 3 or above and 50% or more scored below level 3.

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)

By June 2023, will decrease the number of student who are 1+ years behind in ELA by 50% to only have 70% of all k-2 students on or above grade level in ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June 2023, students will increase ELA Achievement by 3%, earning 56% proficiency, on the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

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.

This area of focus will be monitored using iReady, state Progress Monitoring, and district tests.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lamb, Brie, brie.lamb@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?

The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning), Differentiated Instruction, and coaching and feedback. Additionally using Benchmark Advance for whole group and small group instruction and LLI for tiered intervention.

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?

Benchmark Advance is our peer-reviewed adopted text book materials for ELA instruction which creates consistency between classrooms and grade levels. Additionally, LLI is a researched based intervention used to provide targeted instruction. Also, coaching will be provided during modeling and CLPs as part of our literacy plan, and our Reading Interventionist will provide tier interventions and monitor all students ELA progress.

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
Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for whole group and small group.	Lamb, Brie, brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org
Provide school-based coaching and support in Collaborative Learning and Planning, model for teachers, and provide ELA professional development.	Knab, Heather, heather.knab@stlucieschools.org
Common grade level CLP times for all teachers including ESE, additional CLP meetings after school hours, and ELA professional development.	Lamb, Brie, brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org
Monitor implementation and effectiveness tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.	Ackenbrack, Cara-Ann, cara-ann.ackenbrack@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.

Windmill Point Elementary will build a positive school culture and environment by including parents, staff, and community members in the decision making and planning process by encouraging open lines of transparent communication and feedback. We will launch our year with Kindergarten Round-up, an event to welcome new students, provide parents a tour of the school, offer resources, and allow students to meet teacher and spend time in the learning environment. Additionally, we had our traditional Open House, where students and parents met their teacher, visited their classroom, and toured the school. Windmill Point Elementary will continue to have SAC (School Advisory Council) and PTO(Parent Teacher Organization) meeting monthly. We will provide meeting information and other parent involvement opportunities within our monthly newsletter and calendar. In addition, we will communicate daily via Student Planners and Class Dojo, weekly via Tuesday Folders, and through ongoing use of School Messenger and

Skyward. Assessments and curriculum information will be discussed throughout the year. These times may include student led conferences, School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conferences, IEP meetings, PST meetings, and MTSS meetings. Progress monitoring, data, including, but not limited to FSA, iReady, and district assessments will be shared with parents during SAC meetings and parent conference. Additionally we have several family events including: Barnes and Nobles Night, Curriculum night, Publix Math Night, Doughnuts with Dad, Muffins with Mom, Literacy Night, and Family Read Alouds.

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

Brie Lamb, Principal, monitor for implementation of SEL and SAC chairperson. Leah Naomi Reals (Assistant Principal) and Lakeitha Jackson (Assistant Principal) monitor the implementation of SEL, Community Involvement Committee, and PBIS. Teachers will implement SEL and participate in Parent and Family Involvement Committee. SAC committee will provide feedback and suggestions to SEL implementation based on student survey data. Heather Knab (Reading Coach and Family Liaison) will organize events to bring the school, families, and the community together.