

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

St. Lucie - 0301 - Port St. Lucie High School - 2022-23 SIP

## Port St. Lucie High School

1201 SE JAGUAR LN, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

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

Demographics

## Principal: Nicole Tel ESE

Start Date for this Principal: 6/6/2022

| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Active  |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | Yes   |
| 2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)   | 70%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: C (50%)<br>2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*   |
| 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. F   | or more information, <u>click here</u> .  |
|   |   |

### **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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

### 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               | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

St. Lucie - 0301 - Port St. Lucie High School - 2022-23 SIP

## Port St. Lucie High School

1201 SE JAGUAR LN, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

### http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/phs/

**School Demographics** 

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID F |                     | 2021-22 Title I School | l Disadvan          | <b>Economically</b><br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---|
| High Scho<br>9-12                 | bol                 | Yes                    |                     | 70%   |
| Primary Servic<br>(per MSID F     | • •                 | Charter School         | (Reporte            | <b>Minority Rate</b><br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation            | No                     |                     | 66%   |
| School Grades Histo               | ory                 |                        |                     |   |
| Year<br>Grade                     | <b>2021-22</b><br>C | 2020-21                | <b>2019-20</b><br>B | <b>2018-19</b><br>B   |
| School Board Appro                | val                 |                        |                     |   |

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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

### **Part I: School Information**

#### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Port St. Lucie High School is to ensure all students feel safe and cared for, equipped with the knowledge, skills, and desire to succeed.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Port St. Lucie High School, in partnership with parents and community, will become a premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. Our name will be synonymous with the continuous improvement of student achievement and the success of each individual. Our promise is to move from good to great focusing on the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for each child, every day.

### 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Telese,<br>Nicole       | Principal              | All School wide operations, in addition to Aspiring Administrators, Athletics, School Budgets, and the School Counseling Department.  |
| Belgraves,<br>Myrna     | Assistant<br>Principal | Senior Class (12th Grade), Exceptional Student Education (ESE), Career<br>and Technical Education (CTE), World Languages, JROTC, Roster<br>Verification, Staff Celebrations, Student Government, School Improvement<br>Plan & Graduation.   |
| Lee,<br>Matthew         | Assistant<br>Principal | Junior Class (11th Grade), Biology & U.S. History Departments,<br>Attendance, Athletics, Facilities, Emergency Planning, Powered Up and<br>New Teacher Development (NEST).  |
| Saget,<br>Louisa        | Assistant<br>Principal | Sophomore Class (10th Grade), English, Language Arts (ELA) & Reading Departments, Title 1, English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), School Assessment Administrator, Master Schedule & Jag Services.   |
| Manchester,<br>Kathleen | Assistant<br>Principal | Freshman Class (9th Grade), Math, Physical Education & Performing Arts<br>Departments, New Student Orientation, SEL Team Coordinator, School<br>Clinic, School Advisory Council (SAC), Professional Development Tracking,<br>Student and Faculty Handbooks.                               |
| Wichern,<br>Kristina    | Instructional<br>Coach | Math Instructional Coach  |
| Rodriguez,<br>Kareem    | Dean                   | 11th & 12th Grade Discipline, Attendance, Transportation, Title IX and Peer Mediation   |
| Sigmon,<br>Glenna       | Instructional<br>Coach | ELA Instructional Coach responsible for supporting teachers with the new BEST Standards and assisting with pull outs and small group instruction for students.  |
| Keith,<br>Jeffery       | Other                  | Collaborate with all stakeholders to heighten awareness regarding<br>instruction, and learning strategies for disabled students. Monitor student<br>data, review, and verify student IEPs and facilitate meetings. Communicate<br>regularly with parents and students with disabilities.  |
| Aleus,<br>Mario         | Other                  | Collaborate with all stakeholders to heighten awareness regarding<br>instruction, and learning strategies for disabled students. Monitor student<br>data, review, and verify student IEPs, and facilitate meetings.<br>Communicate regularly with parents and students with disabilities. |
| Sheffield,<br>Dana      | Graduation<br>Coach    | Monitor students' progress towards graduation, counsel students and families, develop strategies to support and improve students' academic  |

| Name                    | Position<br>Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---|
|                         |                   | achievement and host Hope meetings to educate and inform families about students' academic progress.                                    |
| Kendziorski,<br>Michael | Other             | Provide support to at-risk Math students (Push in and/or Pull out), monitor Math data, and create plans to support struggling students. |
| Wright,<br>Ronald       | Dean              | 9th & 10th Grade Discipline, Attendance, PBIS and Peer Mediation  |

### Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 6/6/2022, Nicole Tel ESE

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.

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 99

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,676

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year. 17

**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:

| Indiantar  |   |   |   |   |   |   | Gra | ade | e L | evel |     |     |     | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator  | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9    | 10  | 11  | 12  | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 432  | 461 | 389 | 394 | 1676  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 188  | 233 | 224 | 209 | 854   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 90   | 59  | 40  | 13  | 202   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 94   | 115 | 121 | 111 | 441   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 179  | 177 | 122 | 77  | 555   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 130  | 150 | 71  | 52  | 403   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 67   | 161 | 84  | 54  | 366   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 163  | 186 | 105 | 97  | 551   |

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                            |   |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e L | evel |     |     |     | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7   | 8   | 9    | 10  | 11  | 12  | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 0   | 251  | 279 | 216 | 171 | 917   |

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

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

### 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:

| Indiantar  |   |   |   |   |   |   | Gra | ade | e L | evel |     |     |     | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator  | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9    | 10  | 11  | 12  | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 441  | 467 | 418 | 425 | 1751  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 153  | 173 | 178 | 114 | 618   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 48   | 41  | 8   | 5   | 102   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 118  | 138 | 135 | 78  | 469   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 111  | 157 | 121 | 66  | 455   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 130  | 103 | 82  | 21  | 336   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 88   | 114 | 95  | 2   | 299   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 65   | 53  | 41  | 11  | 170   |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   |   | Gra | ade | Le | vel |     |     |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8  | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0  | 226 | 223 | 197 | 92 | 738   |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiaatar                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                           | κ | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 4  | 4     |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4  | 2  | 9  | 19    |  |

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

| Indiantar  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     | Total |     |     |       |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator  | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10    | 11  | 12  | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 441 | 467   | 418 | 425 | 1751  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 173   | 178 | 114 | 618   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 41    | 8   | 5   | 102   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 138   | 135 | 78  | 469   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 157   | 121 | 66  | 455   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 103   | 82  | 21  | 336   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88  | 114   | 95  | 2   | 299   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 53    | 41  | 11  | 170   |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|-------|
| mulcator                             | κ | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 223 | 197 | 92 | 738   |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiaatar                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 4     | 4     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4  | 2  | 9     | 19    |

### 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).

| Sahaal Crada Component      |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 41%    | 46%      | 51%   |        |          |       | 53%    | 51%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 44%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 26%    |          |       |        |          |       | 36%    | 36%      | 42%   |
| Math Achievement            | 26%    | 37%      | 38%   |        |          |       | 49%    | 40%      | 51%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 36%    |          |       |        |          |       | 37%    | 41%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 35%    |          |       |        |          |       | 37%    | 38%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         | 53%    | 29%      | 40%   |        |          |       | 79%    | 71%      | 68%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 54%    | 43%      | 48%   |        |          |       | 67%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |

|       | MATH |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |

|       | SCIENCE |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 76%    | 71%      | 5%                          | 67%   | 9%                       |
|      |        | CIVIC    | SEOC                        |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      | · · · |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 65%    | 68%      | -3%                         | 70%   | -5%                      |
|      |        | ALGEE    | RA EOC                      | · · · |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 30%    | 51%      | -21%                        | 61%   | -31%                     |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 59%    | 55%      | 4%                          | 57%   | 2%                       |

## Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 18          | 26        | 20                | 10           | 29         | 30                 | 32          | 31         |              | 93                      | 59                        |
| ELL       | 17          | 37        | 34                | 20           | 38         | 38                 | 26          | 27         |              | 100                     | 82                        |
| ASN       | 62          | 64        |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              | 100                     | 92                        |
| BLK       | 33          | 40        | 23                | 20           | 40         | 43                 | 48          | 44         |              | 97                      | 84                        |
| HSP       | 37          | 40        | 25                | 27           | 37         | 33                 | 49          | 47         |              | 100                     | 83                        |
| MUL       | 44          | 41        | 30                | 27           | 21         |                    | 53          | 58         |              | 100                     | 93                        |
| WHT       | 50          | 49        | 31                | 30           | 33         | 25                 | 63          | 65         |              | 98                      | 86                        |
| FRL       | 37          | 40        | 26                | 25           | 37         | 39                 | 51          | 57         |              | 99                      | 84                        |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          | ·                       |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 17          | 39        | 34                | 15           | 23         | 20                 | 27          | 27         |              | 91                      | 52                        |
| ELL       | 20          | 32        | 42                | 12           | 30         | 35                 | 50          | 42         |              | 100                     | 87                        |

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| ASN       | 50          |           |                   | 50           |            |                    |             | 70         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 38          | 33        | 17                | 16           | 23         | 22                 | 49          | 49         |              | 99                      | 81                        |
| HSP       | 41          | 42        | 37                | 16           | 26         | 25                 | 60          | 51         |              | 97                      | 81                        |
| MUL       | 55          | 46        |                   | 36           | 19         |                    | 68          | 47         |              | 94                      | 94                        |
| WHT       | 48          | 46        | 39                | 25           | 18         | 15                 | 63          | 65         |              | 96                      | 85                        |
| FRL       | 39          | 38        | 29                | 17           | 21         | 22                 | 55          | 50         |              | 96                      | 82                        |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         | <u>.</u>                  |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 26          | 29        | 20                | 35           | 30         | 25                 | 44          | 44         |              | 98                      | 49                        |
| ELL       | 35          | 38        | 32                | 67           | 30         |                    | 65          |            |              | 85                      | 88                        |
| ASN       | 85          | 70        |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              | 90                      |                           |
| BLK       | 43          | 44        | 43                | 40           | 42         | 37                 | 63          | 57         |              | 96                      | 82                        |
| HSP       | 49          | 48        | 35                | 50           | 35         | 27                 | 80          | 64         |              | 96                      | 90                        |
| MUL       | 56          | 44        |                   | 35           | 13         |                    | 86          |            |              | 95                      | 79                        |
| WHT       | 58          | 50        | 32                | 52           | 40         | 48                 | 86          | 72         |              | 99                      | 80                        |
| FRL       | 49          | 48        | 36                | 45           | 37         | 31                 | 75          | 65         |              | 97                      | 81                        |

### 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  | 49   |
| 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 | 45   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 543  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 11   |
| Percent Tested  | 97%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 35   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |

St. Lucie - 0301 - Port St. Lucie High School - 2022-23 SIP

| English Language Learners   |     |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners   | 42  |
| 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  | 80  |
| 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   | 47  |
|   |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?<br>Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
|   | 0   |
| Hispanic Students   | 40  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | 48  |
| 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  | 52  |
| 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  | 53  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%   | 0   |

St. Lucie - 0301 - Port St. Lucie High School - 2022-23 SIP

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 50 |
| 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?

Mathematics Achievement: Math achievement increased by 5 points from the 20-21 school year to 26%. Although this is an improvement, it is still well below the state average and the 49% earned during the 18-19 school year. Math learning gains also increased from 22% during the 20-21 school year to 36% in the 21-22 school year. The lowest 25% also increased from 22% during the 20-21 school year to 35% in the 21-22 school year.

English Language Arts (ELA): The ELA Achievement data showed a slight decrease from 44% to 41% in Proficiency, and the lowest 25% also decreased from 32% to 26%. While learning gains increased from 41% to 44%.

Science Achievement: During the 18-19 school year, science achievement was at an all-time high of 79%. Sadly, it's been on the decline in subsequent years. 59% during the 20-21 school year, to 53% Proficiency during the 21-22 school year.

Social Studies Achievement: Social Studies achievement also is on the decline. During the 18-19 school year it was at an all-time high of 67%, it then fell to 55% during the 20-21 school year and then dropped another percentage point to 54% Proficiency during the 21-22 school year.

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

Based on the 2022 state assessments all academic areas have tremendous opportunities for growth...our growth goals are:

Improving English Language Arts (ELA) from 41% - 45%

Improving Math from 26% - 45%

Improving Social Studies from 54% - 60%

Improving Science from 53% - 60%

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

Math, English Language Arts (ELA), Social Studies & Science: The contributing factors that led to the need for improvements include: Teacher turnover, significant COVID absences of both teachers and

students, and academic deficiencies due to virtual schooling for two years. Increasing the academic gap and overall lack of proficiency in all subject areas.

The new actions needed to address these improvements in ELA and Math are target remediation. Specifically, hiring a Math Instructional Coach, responsible for supporting teachers in mastering the new Florida BEST standards and planning for rigorous and aligned instruction. The ELA Instructional Coach will also be retained and will support ELA teachers with targeted instruction. In addition to leading the work with collaborative planning.

In Social Studies & Science targeted strand remediation, specifically during collaborative planning, will be essential to notable improvements.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was Math learning gains which improved from 22% to 36% and Math Lowest 25, which improved from 22% to 35%. Also noteworthy is the increase in Math proficiency from 21% to 26%.

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

The contributing factor to this improvement was the strong Collaborative and Learning Planning (CLP) Team that met regularly to ensure that the curriculum was implemented with fidelity. Teachers also created an incentive system that motivated students to learn while also offering remediation through after-school tutoring.

This year not only was the Math Interventionist retained but a Math Coach was added to provide support to both teachers and at-risk students.

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

The strategies that will be implemented to accelerate learning are:

- Utilize the planning guides to focus on student misconceptions
- Increase focus on vocabulary and math discourse
- Teaching to the depth of the standards
- Well-aligned checks for understanding (CFU)

# 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.

District and school-wide professional development was offered during Pre-planning week and will continue throughout the school year. To include:

- I succeed Data tracking to monitor and offer support to at-risk students
- Training for BEST Standards (ELA & Math)
- Collaborative & Learning Planning Team Facilitation Trainings
- Math discourse

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

The following additional services will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement in the coming years:

- Math Coach
- Math Interventionist
- After School Tutoring
- ELA Instructional / Reading Coach
- Collaborative & Learning Planning Teams
- Small Group remediation
- Supplemental computer-based instruction

### Areas of Focus

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

### **#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

| #1. ESSA Subgroup spec  | incarly relating to Students with Disabilities  |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a rationale that<br>explains how it was<br>identified as a critical<br>need from the data<br>reviewed.              | Students with Disabilities Subgroup data indicates that students with disabilities are not performing at the same level as their peers. In fact, for two consecutive years, students have performed below the federal index of 41%.   |
| Measurable Outcome:<br>State the specific<br>measurable outcome<br>the school plans to<br>achieve. This should be<br>a data based, objective<br>outcome.                      | Students with disabilities will no longer be an area of concern in the ESSA data and will meet the federal guidelines by performing at or above 41%.  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this Area<br>of Focus will be<br>monitored for the<br>desired outcome.  | The ESE Specialist will meet weekly with the Assistant Principal to review the data as it relates to ESE students and provide support to teachers to meet their individual needs. In addition, data from progress monitoring assessments will be reviewed by Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Support specialists while conducting data chats.   |
| Person responsible for<br>monitoring outcome:   | Myrna Belgraves (myrna.tamar-belgraves@stlucieschools.org)  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the evidence-<br>based strategy being<br>implemented for this<br>Area of Focus.   | <ol> <li>Collaborative Planning - Support Teachers will serve as active participants<br/>in CLP's</li> <li>Effective monitoring of students</li> <li>Strict adherence to student IEP's and 504's</li> <li>Support Teachers monitoring for students with D's &amp; F's and contacting<br/>families to coordinate support</li> <li>Quarterly Interim Reports sent to families</li> </ol>                        |
| Rationale for Evidence-<br>based Strategy:<br>Explain the rationale for<br>selecting this specific<br>strategy. Describe the<br>resources/criteria used<br>for selecting this | Additional support teachers were hired and placed strategically into classes<br>based on their expertise. Students will in turn receive expert support leading to<br>improved overall achievement. Additionally, as support teachers plan regularly<br>with their colleagues they will have a greater understanding of the standards<br>and can customize and adjust to meet the needs of their ESE students. |

### 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.

Identify and train staff on the role of classroom support teachers along with monitoring the contact of support teachers with their students.

**Person Responsible** Mario Aleus (mario.aleus@stlucieschools.org)

Train ESE teachers on the PEER updates along with reviewing students' Individual Education Plan.

**Person Responsible** Jeffery Keith (jeffery.keith@stlucieschools.org)

Regularly check grades and attendance to monitor students' progress towards successfully completing their courses and follow up with case managers to ensure that students' needs are met.

Person Responsible Myrna Belgraves (myrna.tamar-belgraves@stlucieschools.org)

### **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation**

| #2. Instructional Pr   | actice specifically relating to Graduation   |
|--|--|
| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a rationale<br>that explains how<br>it was identified<br>as a critical need<br>from the data<br>reviewed.                                | Upon successfully showing proficiency in core assessments, completing all required courses, and earning at least a 2.0 GPA students can graduate. Due to the number of students that require remediation or have credit deficiencies, graduation is an area that will need to be monitored closely.  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans to<br>achieve. This<br>should be a data<br>based, objective<br>outcome.                                  | 100% of actively enrolled students will successfully complete the required courses and testing requirements for graduation.  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this<br>Area of Focus will<br>be monitored for<br>the desired<br>outcome.  | There are many individuals involved in supporting students' path to graduation. The Principal will monitor the systems. The Assistant Principal will keep track of at-risk "ISucceed" students and monitor their progress towards graduation, while the Graduation Coach will monitor individual student progress to ensure that they have met the requirements and offer support as needed including credit retrieval for deficient students. Guidance Counselors will conduct credit checks and provide reminders for SAT / ACT offerings. |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:  | Nicole Telese (nicole.telese@stlucieschools.org)   |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-based<br>strategy being<br>implemented for<br>this Area of<br>Focus.   | <ol> <li>Monitor Students' progress &amp; overall grades</li> <li>Monitor Students' attendance</li> <li>Provide intensive, individualized support to students and families</li> <li>Provide tutoring and other remediation for SAT / ACT</li> </ol>  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Explain the<br>rationale for<br>selecting this<br>specific strategy.<br>Describe the<br>resources/criteria<br>used for selecting<br>this strategy. | The aforementioned strategies all provide intensive and individualized support to students on the path to graduation. Data will be collected and analyzed to assess their effectiveness.   |

### **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.

Assistant Principal monitors at-risk 12th-grade students.

### Person Responsible Myrna Belgraves (myrna.tamar-belgraves@stlucieschools.org)

The Graduation Coach analyzes data, monitors, and supports struggling students.

### Person Responsible Dana Sheffield (dana.sheffield@stlucieschools.org)

Teacher's Aide pushes in to provide support to credit deficient students in credit recovery classes and works closely with the Graduation Coach.

### Person Responsible Dana Sheffield (dana.sheffield@stlucieschools.org)

Bi-weekly Graduation meetings are held with the Graduation Team to assess students' progress towards completion, along with their successes on testing requirements.

Person Responsible Nicole Telese (nicole.telese@stlucieschools.org)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a rationale that<br>explains how it was<br>identified as a critical<br>need from the data<br>reviewed.                           | English Language Arts (ELA) Achievement: ELA proficiency is an area targeted for improvement. Specifically, as it relates to understanding the new BEST Standards and collaborating on ways to teach them effectively to students.  |  |
| Measurable Outcome:<br>State the specific<br>measurable outcome the<br>school plans to achieve.<br>This should be a data<br>based, objective<br>outcome.                                   | Goal: 45% of students will be proficient in ELA. To accomplish this, Teachers will increase knowledge of the BEST Standards through professional development opportunities along with Collaborative Learning Planning Teams. Further, data from student progress monitoring will be used to track students' overall progress and make adjustments to instruction. |  |
|  | <ul> <li>Teachers will participate in 120 minutes of Collaborative Planning weekly.</li> <li>Teachers will analyze student work samples and plan target-based lessons.</li> </ul>   |  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this Area<br>of Focus will be<br>monitored for the<br>desired outcome.   | <ul> <li>District Progress monitoring will be conducted to measure students'<br/>knowledge of the standards.</li> </ul>   |  |
|  | - Data trackers will be utilized to ensure progress is being made.  |  |
|  | - Literacy walk-throughs will occur weekly. This will ensure standard-based instruction and will provide consistency amongst classroom teachers.  |  |
|  | - Achieve 3000 data will be analyzed weekly. Student and teacher usage will be monitored in order to ensure an increase in Lexile levels.   |  |
|  | - Unit Assessment data will be analyzed at the end of each unit.  |  |
|  | - Progress Monitoring data (PM1 & PM2) will be used for planning and decision-making.   |  |
| Person responsible for<br>monitoring outcome:  | Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)  |  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the evidence-<br>based strategy being<br>implemented for this<br>Area of Focus.  | Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) monitored by the Assistant<br>Principal and ELA Instructional Coach will take place during common<br>planning. Instructors teaching like classes will work together to create<br>rigorous lessons based on the standards.   |  |
| Rationale for Evidence-<br>based Strategy:<br>Explain the rationale for<br>selecting this specific<br>strategy. Describe the<br>resources/criteria used<br>for selecting this<br>strategy. | Ensuring that all teachers work together collaboratively to design quality lessons and streamline the planning and data evaluation process.   |  |

### **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.

Accurate scheduling - ensure that all teachers have the same planning period.

**Person Responsible** Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)

Assistant Principal & ELA Instructional Coach attend CLP's to check for fidelity, monitor progress, and analyze data.

**Person Responsible** Glenna Sigmon (glenna.sigmon@stlucieschools.org)

ELA Instructional Coach pushes into classes and conducts small group instruction.

Person Responsible Glenna Sigmon (glenna.sigmon@stlucieschools.org)

Tutoring - Lunch & After school as needed

**Person Responsible** Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)

### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale that<br>explains how it<br>was identified as<br>a critical need<br>from the data<br>reviewed. | Math Learning Gains & Achievement – There was an increase in student Math achievement from 21 percentage points to 26 percentage points. Math learning gains showed an increase from 22% to 36%, which is an increase of 14 percentage points. Historically we have been below the district and state average, indicating that more targeted intervention is needed as well as a focus on standards-based instruction, monitoring, and interventions for our at-risk students. Although math proficiency improved, there is still progress to be made. |
|--|--|
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans to<br>achieve. This<br>should be a data<br>based, objective<br>outcome.      | 45% of students will be proficient in Math. To accomplish this both the Math Coach<br>and the Interventionist will push into Math classes as well as pull out targeted small<br>groups weekly.<br>An increase in Math achievement by 19 percentage points.   |
|  | Teachers will participate in 120 minutes of Collaborative Planning weekly. Teachers will analyze student work samples, and plan target-based lessons.  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this<br>Area of Focus will<br>be monitored for<br>the desired<br>outcome.  |  |
|  | Teacher made CFU's (Check for understandings) will be utilized to track student performance weekly.  |
|  | Math walk-throughs will occur weekly. This will ensure standard-based instruction and will provide consistency amongst classroom teachers.   |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:  | Kathleen Manchester (kathleen.manchester@stlucieschools.org)   |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-based<br>strategy being<br>implemented for<br>this Area of<br>Focus.   | Through collaborative planning, teachers will identify research-based interventions to increase student achievement towards targeted state BEST standards. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted by the administration and the math coach to assess the fidelity of classroom instruction. Data will be monitored by administration and the math coach to be used for planning and remediation. Afterschool boot camps, pullouts, push-ins, tutoring opportunities, and academic incentives will be made available.                                 |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Explain the  | Through collaborative planning teachers and administration have identified the above strategies as they have been proven to yield success. Teachers have also agreed upon offering after school tutoring and the math coach will conduct boot camps and pull-outs.   |

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.

Accurate scheduling - ensure that all teachers have the same planning period.

Person Responsible Louisa Saget (louisa.saget@stlucieschools.org)

Assistant Principal & Instructional Coach attend CLP's to check for fidelity, monitor progress, and analyze data.

### Person

Responsible Kathleen Manchester (kathleen.manchester@stlucieschools.org)

Math Coach & Interventionist push into classes and pull-out students to conduct small group instruction.

Person Responsible Michael Kendziorski (michael.kendziorski@stlucieschools.org)

After-school and Saturday tutoring.

Person Responsible Kristina Wichern (kristina.wichern@stlucieschools.org)

### **#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to I Succeed Initiative**

| Area of Focus Description<br>and Rationale:<br>Include a rationale that<br>explains how it was<br>identified as a critical need<br>from the data reviewed.                              | To reduce not only the reoccurring Level 1 & 2 discipline offenses, but an overall reduction in Level 3 & 4 offenses. Along with providing Tier 2 & 3 supports for students with behavioral concerns.  |
|---|--|
| Measurable Outcome:<br>State the specific<br>measurable outcome the<br>school plans to achieve.<br>This should be a data<br>based, objective outcome.                                   | Reduction in the number of Level 3 & 4 offenses along with overall improvement in the school climate.<br>Reduction in the number of D's & F's (all grade levels)   |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this Area of<br>Focus will be monitored for<br>the desired outcome.   | <ul> <li>Student Climate Survey</li> <li>School Climate Survey</li> <li>Positive Behavior Intervention &amp; Support (PBIS)</li> <li>Power BI discipline data</li> <li>Skyward grades</li> </ul>   |
| Person responsible for<br>monitoring outcome:   | Kathleen Manchester (kathleen.manchester@stlucieschools.org)   |
| Evidence-based Strategy:<br>Describe the evidence-<br>based strategy being<br>implemented for this Area<br>of Focus.  | <ul> <li>Single School Culture scripts were created for (Dress code, Tardies &amp; Cell phone usage)</li> <li>Closely monitor grades &amp; discipline</li> <li>PBIS Committee meets to analyze and review data</li> <li>Weekly phone calls home "Connect Ed" to families indicating student performance</li> </ul> |
| Rationale for Evidence-<br>based Strategy:<br>Explain the rationale for<br>selecting this specific<br>strategy. Describe the<br>resources/criteria used for<br>selecting this strategy. | Single School Culture establishes shared norms, beliefs, values, and goals and results in agreed-upon processes and procedures to ensure consistency across the campus. By monitoring grades and discipline data closely, the PBIS committee can incentivize good behavior and overall academic achievement.       |
| Action Steps to Implement   | taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the  |

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.

Single School Culture Staff Training.

| Person Responsible | Nicole Telese (nicole.telese@stlucieschoo | ols.org) |
|--------------------|---|----------|
|--------------------|---|----------|

Preschool / Initial meetings will students and parents by Administrators.

Person Responsible Nicole Telese (nicole.telese@stlucieschools.org)

Weekly monitoring of attendance grades and discipline .

 Person Responsible
 Nicole Telese (nicole.telese@stlucieschools.org)

Problem-solving meetings based on student discipline data to include School Counselors for academics.

Person Responsible Kathleen Manchester (kathleen.manchester@stlucieschools.org)

Review data through Positive Behavior Intervention & Support (PBIS) meetings.

Person Responsible Kathleen Manchester (kathleen.manchester@stlucieschools.org)

### #6. -- 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.

At Port St. Lucie High School we believe that every child can and will learn. We strive to create an environment where all students feel safe and cared for. Building positive relationships is the first step to ensuring that this mission is met. Single school culture is essential to the success of the school and during the preplanning week all on-campus stakeholders are charged with reviewing the school's mission and vision along with the expectations for the school year. New this year, Single School culture scripts were created around Tardies, Cellphone usage, and Dress Code.

Parent/community meetings are held throughout the year to encourage dialog and support the school-tohome connection such as Student-led Conferences and Parent/Agency Nights for ESE and ESOL, as well as through our School Advisory Council (SAC), and unique arts programs. Through social media and the school website, information is freely shared with families. The Jaguar Guardian parent group was established this year to engage families with the school and provide assistance to the school and teachers as needed.

As a one-to-one school, where each student and teacher are provided with a laptop; technology is a major component of our culture and environment. Families without computer or internet access are supported through the Parent communication room located in the main office, where they can access a computer and print if needed. Through partnerships with the community, families are connected to resources and can rely on the school to offer support and assistance. This in turn creates a positive school culture where all stakeholders receive the necessary communication and feel valued and supported.

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

The entire administrative team and staff work towards building a positive school culture and a safe and caring environment. Teachers are encouraged to greet students with a warm welcome at the door daily. Students begin each day with a moment of silence, which they can use for self-reflection or any other silent activity.

Additionally, through the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) Team, initiatives and incentives are provided to encourage student attendance and address other discipline concerns. We are working towards providing a strong sense of community, where students are encouraged to get involved in the many after-school clubs, organizations, and athletics available, so they can feel rewarded and a part of the school family.