

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Lakewood Park Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lakewood Park Elementary School

7800 INDRIIO RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34951

<http://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/lwp/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Kathleen Melrose**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CSI

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lakewood Park Elementary School

7800 INDRIO RD, Fort Pierce, FL 34951

<http://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/lwp/>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	89%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The mission of Lakewood Park Elementary is to provide all students a safe and positive learning environment, focused on rigorous academic curriculum, and continuous student achievement.

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

Lakewood Park, in partnership with families and the community, will strive to be a premiere learning center of academic excellence. Each student will be afforded the opportunity to reach his or her maximum potential to be a successful citizen in the global society.

### 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
Burke, Natalee	School Counselor	
Monroe, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Deubel, Mattie	Instructional Coach	
Carter, Charlene	Reading Coach	
Felt, Cheryl	School Counselor	
Steward, Ashley	Math Coach	
Forsyth, Mary	Other	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Kathleen Melrose

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

23

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

44

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

620

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

15

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

15

**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	103	98	103	102	106	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
Attendance below 90 percent	53	48	48	50	43	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	293
One or more suspensions	5	8	6	10	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	2	36	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	51	40	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	3	8	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	7	6	45	41	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/18/2022

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



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	49	64	51	37	31	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	1	9	9	6	9	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	10	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	42	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	42	51	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	4	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

**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	2	15	4	42	48	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	49	64	51	37	31	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	1	9	9	6	9	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	10	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	42	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	42	51	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	4	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

**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	2	15	4	42	48	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%	46%	56%				39%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						49%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						54%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	33%	43%	50%				44%	53%	63%
Math Learning Gains	49%						29%	50%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						40%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	50%	59%				36%	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	43%	50%	-7%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	27%	48%	-21%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	58%	55%	3%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	21%	47%	-26%	60%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	34%	46%	-12%	53%	-19%
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	23	43	38	19	33	22	14				
ELL	27	43	31	30	51	41	33				
BLK	32	52	37	25	44	48	41				
HSP	32	43	38	32	47	47	40				
MUL	36			36							
WHT	43	47	30	45	59	36	42				
FRL	31	49	37	29	49	49	37				

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	21	6		20	12		29				
ELL	28	38		28	14		26				
BLK	35	31	17	28	8		18				
HSP	30	38		25	13		14				
MUL	69			62							
WHT	45	58		40	16		42				
FRL	37	43	18	31	12	5	26				
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	21	41	50	27	31	38	21				
ELL	30	54	47	40	32	36	11				
BLK	27	45	48	33	25	38	25				
HSP	36	53	60	42	28		20				
MUL	53			47							
WHT	51	51		57	34	60	58				
FRL	29	44	48	36	25	31	26				

**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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	34
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Lakewood Park continues to score below district data. Only 35 % of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in the area of reading and 33% in Math. Lakewood Park had 47.9% of students score a level 1 in Math as compared to the districts 35%, likewise in Reading Lakewood Park had 40.7% score a level 1 in Reading as compared to the districts 27.4%

Subgroup data shows our white students consistently outscore our black students in Math proficiency:  
 2019 - WHT 57 BLK 33  
 2021 - WHT 40 BLK 28  
 2022- WHT 45 BLK 25

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

Since our 3-5 data is well below 50% proficiency, our greatest need for improvement is increasing proficiency with an emphasis on building foundational skills in K-2. Struggles in effective collaborative planning as well as implementation of standards-based instruction and reteach was a contributing factor to this low performance. Additionally due to the change in standards as well as core resources, additional professionally development will be required to increase teachers' knowledge of these standards and implementation of the new resources.

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

Gaps of instruction due to Covid, lack of ownership in collaborative planning, low socioeconomic status (We have 53 students that are currently coded as homeless), discipline issues, student/teacher attendance and teacher turnover are some of the contributing factors to this need for improvement. In addition, deeper aggressive monitoring of our ongoing progress monitoring data will need to be occur. Ongoing job-embedded professional development will be required to increase teachers' knowledge of the new standards and implementation of our newly adopted resources. Strategic, focused small group instruction and independent tasks will be developed and reevaluated regularly to ensure systematic targeted instruction.

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

The areas that showed the mot improvement include Bottom Quartile ELA 2021-17%, 2022- 36%, Bottom Quartile Math 2021- 4%, 2022 45%, and Science Proficiency 2021 - 26% 2022 41%.

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

Additional small group instruction for bottom quartile students occurred throughout the day as well as additional tutoring after the regular school day. Implementation of PENDA science as well as hands on science activities contributed to the gain in science proficiency.

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

Daily collaborative planning as well as additional progress monitoring will be necessary to close the current achievement gaps. Additional support, including coaching & interventionist support, as well as professional learning on the new standards and instructional materials are critical to accelerate learning this school year. Strategic small group instruction will be emphasized.

**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.**

Instructional coaches will provide ongoing support during collaborative planning as well as feedback on lesson implementation. Additionally, ongoing training on the new reading & math series as well as standards and tiered resources will be imbedded throughout the school year.

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

Hiring of interventionists, instructional coaches for K-2, 3-5 Math and 3-5 ELA, as well as Teachers' Aides will assist in this area. After school tutoring as well as parent and community engagement opportunities will increase overall support of students from all stakeholders.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Tier 1 student behavior.**

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

Analysis of student behavior data and teacher feedback indicated the need to address Tier 1 behavior schoolwide. Lack of student engagement as well as student learning gaps has been identified as factors contributing to inappropriate behaviors.

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

To increase on task behaviors and student engagement as measured by a decrease in student behavior incident reports and student referrals.

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

Monitoring will occur through classroom walk through data as well as through daily reports of behavior incidents. Discipline data as well as Tiered Intervention data will be shared monthly at PBIS core team meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lauren Monroe (lauren.monroe@stlucieschools.org)

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

Explicit instruction and training with PBIS and CHAMPS will be implemented. Continued focus on the district's iSucceed initiative and daily community circles.

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

Intentional focus on Tier 1 behavior will reduce discipline concerns as well as enhance a positive learning environment. This will in turn increase instructional time on task in classrooms.

**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.

1. PBIS & CHAMPS Training
2. School-Wide Expectations displayed and practiced
3. CHAMPS classroom management plans
4. Implementation of Daily Circles
5. Monthly PBIS Committee Meeting
6. Monthly school-wide discipline data review
7. Ongoing support and training from school-based behavior team as needed.

**Person Responsible**

Lauren Monroe (lauren.monroe@stlucieschools.org)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**

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

Due to the transition to the new standards as well as new math and reading core curriculum, there is a significant need to focus on Tier 1 instruction of the B.E.S.T Standards which will in turn increase student proficiency.

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

We expect at least 50% of our students to reach proficiency in the areas of Reading & Math by the end of the school year.

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

Monitoring will occur through lesson plans, observation data, and progress monitoring student achievement data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kathleen Melrose (kathleen.melrose@stlucieschools.org)

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

Explicit professional learning in the area of collaborative planning facilitation and implementation of the B.E.S.T Standards.

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

This has been selected as an area of focus due to the change in standards and state assessments.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Initial Training with B.E.S.T Standards
2. Ongoing training with new math & reading series
3. Ongoing support with Academic Coaches
4. Strategic monitoring of collaborative planning and lesson implementation
5. Ongoing data tracking and meetings

**Person Responsible**

Kathleen Melrose (kathleen.melrose@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**

On the Spring 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic, 58% of students in grades K-5 were proficient with phonics, 47% in vocabulary, and 49% in comprehension. An area of focus for K-2 this year is going to be on phonics instruction. With targeted skill-based instruction in phonics, students will leave K-2 classrooms with the foundational skills necessary to be fluent readers entering 3rd grade. When students enter 3rd grade without necessary foundational skills in reading, they are not prepared for success on their statewide assessments.

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

On the 2022 ELA FSA, only 35% of 3-5 students scored a Level 3 or higher. On the Spring 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic, 58% of students in grades K-5 were proficient with phonics, 47% in vocabulary, and 49% in comprehension. An area of focus for 3-5 this year is going to be on phonics and vocabulary instruction leading in to fluency and comprehension. With targeted skill-based instruction in phonics and vocabulary, students will leave 3-5 classrooms with the foundational skills necessary perform at a proficient level on statewide assessments.

**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)**

Overall, 58% of students exiting last year were proficient with phonics, 47% in vocabulary, and 49% in comprehension based on the Spring i-Ready Diagnostic. With targeted skill-based instruction, 78% of students will be proficient in phonics, 77% of students will be proficient in vocabulary, and 78% will be proficient on comprehension.

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Overall, 58% of students exiting last year were proficient with phonics, 47% in vocabulary, and 49% in comprehension based on the Spring i-Ready Diagnostic. With targeted skill-based instruction, 78% of students will be proficient in phonics, 77% of students will be proficient in vocabulary, and 78% will be proficient on comprehension.

#### 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.

The school's Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes through collection of data on formative assessments, District Unit Assessments, State Progress Monitors in Fall, Winter, and Spring, and teacher observations. Progress towards goals in our focus areas will be discussed with all stakeholders in monthly SAC meetings, Faculty Advisory council meetings, MTSS response to intervention meetings, as well as grade level Collaborative Planning sessions and data chats.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Melrose, Kathleen, kathleen.melrose@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?

Teachers and Interventionists will provide support to students during the reading block using Heggerty, i-Ready and Benchmark Advance. Additional support during MTSS and reteach block will include instruction with Fountas & Pinnell Literacy, i-Ready, Reading Horizons, and LLI. The identified practices/programs will be monitored through weekly Literacy walks by administration and coaches and follow up in daily Collaborative Planning sessions.

#### 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?

The specific practices/programs described are evidence-based and have shown a record of effectiveness for all areas of focus. Criteria for selecting practices/programs were What Works Clearinghouse and John Hattie's Visible Learning effect sizes.

**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
Lesson Study for all grade chairs and coaches on Collaborative Planning best Practices, Book study with Eric Jensen's Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind, New teacher support and lesson study on Engagement strategies.	Monroe, Lauren, lauren.monroe@stlucieschools.org
Weekly literacy walkthroughs to provide feedback and support instruction.	Melrose, Kathleen, kathleen.melrose@stlucieschools.org
Grouping students to receive targeted skill-based instruction based on needs during MTSS, small group instruction, and reteach blocks.	Monroe, Lauren, lauren.monroe@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.**

Lakewood Park Elementary is committed to building a Single School Culture. Through shared norms, beliefs, values, and goals we will produce consistency in practice in the following areas: academics, behavior, climate, and data. School-wide focus of PBIS expectations and CHAMPS will be prioritized and monitored. All teachers were provided with a training to develop grade level classroom management plans. Additionally, consistent and ongoing system of rewards and recognition have been established. The PBIS team will meet monthly throughout the year to monitor and adjust course as needed.

Additionally, an open line of communication with parents as well as involving community members will be a continued focus for building a positive school culture and environment. The school will provide information regarding parent meetings and events using: Monthly Parent Newsletters, the school website, Skyward Portal, Facebook, School Messenger, and Friday Communication Folders. Information concerning assessments, curriculum information and the way in which it is assessed, and data will be discussed throughout the year. These times may include Open house, student led conferences, School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conferences, IEP meetings, EP meetings, and MTSS meetings. Progress monitoring, data, including, but not limited to STAR, FAST, and district assessments will be shared with parents during SAC meetings and parent conferences. Parents will be notified of SAC and PTO meetings in the parent newsletters, marquee, and Friday Communication folders. The parent newsletter is sent home with students the first part of each month. Activities for that month will be on a calendar within the newsletter. Parental feedback and sign-in sheets will be used to monitor attendance.

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

Lakewood Park Elementary School will continue to involve parents and community members in the decision-making processes and planning via its School Advisory Council meetings, feedback received from parents on an on-going basis during conferences and other collaborative parent school opportunities. The process will begin with Open House prior to the opening of school by making parents feel welcome and inviting them to become partners in their child's education. The process of making parents and families feel welcome and motivating them to become involved will be ongoing. LWP will offer meetings and events at various times throughout the school year to support our parents and families. Our relationships with business partners continue to promote a positive culture and community bond at Lakewood Park.