

St. Lucie Public Schools

Parkway Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Parkway Elementary School

7000 NW SELVITZ RD, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

Demographics

Principal: Latanya Greene

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Parkway Elementary School

7000 NW SELVITZ RD, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">83%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">76%</p>

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.

Our Mission at Parkway Elementary School is to instill the treasures of knowledge, citizenship, and self-esteem in all students. The Parkway family will provide engaging instruction in a safe and caring environment while fostering success and creating lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision at Parkway Elementary, in partnership with parents and community members, is to become a culture of lifelong learners that master challenging content, exceed state standards, and apply critical, independent thinking skills.

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
Greene, LaTanya	Principal	Responsible for the total school program. Establishes and maintains an effective learning climate in the school. Participates in the selection, evaluation and supervision of all school personnel. Establishes guides for proper student conduct and maintaining student discipline. Supervises the school's teaching process.
Mann, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	
Sherman, Justin	School Counselor	
Francois, Sonja	School Counselor	
Scott-Warren, Neeka	Reading Coach	
Rivera, Liz	Math Coach	
Mannarino, Kathleen	Other	ESE Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/10/2019, Latanya Greene

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.*

2

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

502

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

14

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

7

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	79	86	78	81	70	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	44	30	39	34	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	30	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	34	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	2	3	3	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	2	3	27	37	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	72	70	75	73	69	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	12	30	31	29	30	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	24	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	41	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	47	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	70	75	73	69	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	12	30	31	29	30	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	24	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	41	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	47	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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%				44%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						53%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						44%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	41%	43%	50%				37%	53%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						38%	50%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						27%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	50%	59%				48%	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	44%	50%	-6%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	51%	-11%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	48%	-4%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	43%	55%	-12%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	54%	-22%	64%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	46%	-1%	53%	-8%
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	16	54	63	28	59	58	30				
ELL	15	49	44	28	58	59	42				
BLK	35	62	29	40	73	83	36				
HSP	28	56	65	36	50	47	39				
WHT	37	58		42	64		38				
FRL	29	58	48	40	64	63	39				
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	10	20	17	12	40	36	17				
ELL	23	42		25	63		25				
BLK	26	42		27	43		15				
HSP	29	27		30	46		38				
MUL	50			30							
WHT	44	50		48	60		67				
FRL	30	37	20	33	49	31	36				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	11	31	33	9	22	29	27				
ELL	40	58		34	40	40	43				
BLK	38	54	38	27	31	21	52				
HSP	50	61	38	42	38	24	56				
MUL	36			27							
WHT	39	45	56	39	38	45	37				
FRL	42	50	35	36	36	23	52				

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	47
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	29
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	48
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

The trend data indicates that our learning gains in ELA and math consistently outperform our proficiency in ELA, math, and science. In the 2021-2022 school year, proficiency numbers range from 35% - 41% of students proficient, and learning gains range from 51%-61% of students making a learning gain.

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

ELA proficiency is the area that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Teacher turnover during the middle of the school year. Lack of teacher capacity for new teachers and long-term substitutes. Long term effects of COVID 19 pandemic.

Increased focus on CLPs. New math coach and first full year for reading coach. Aggressive monitoring.

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

Bottom quartile learning gains in ELA grew 30% to 51% of students making learning gains.
 Bottom quartile learning gains in Math grew 28% to 60% of students making learning gains.

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

Additional reading interventionist hired to focus on tier 3 instruction and bottom quartile students.
Increased use of small group instruction during ELA.
Increased focus on tier 2 instruction, utilizing a "all hands on deck" approach with all staff members pulling small group and providing interventions.

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

Following the CLP protocol during planning time.
Fidelity walks in all content areas.
Feedback to teachers in a timely manner.
Coach support for teachers.
Interventionists support for students in Tiered 2 and 3.
Laser focus data chat meetings.
Modeling in classrooms.
Focus on bottom quartile students.

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.

CLP Protocol... Get Better Faster
LLI
I-ready
Kagan Structure
Collaborative Facilitator
Science Support

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

Administration will attend all CLP meetings.
First Year implementation of ELA curriculum (Benchmark Advanced)
New math curriculum (Savvas)
Model Classroom

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA.

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

3rd Grade- 28%
4th Grade- 40%
5th Grade- 32%

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of 2023, 51% of the students in grades 3,4, and 5 will show proficiency in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessments, iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring, FAST progressing monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

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

Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan) - Use Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. - Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. - Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons

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

Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group – using monitoring tools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments).

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention

Person Responsible Justin Sherman (justin.sherman@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback

Person Responsible Dana Miller (dana.miller@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

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

If the instructional practice improves, all students will have access to high quality learning experiences. By targeting reading proficiency, we will increase overall achievement in all subject areas. This will naturally decrease the number of students needing additional supports through Tier 2 and Tier 3.

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

Increase proficiency in ELA from 35% to 50% and Learning Gains from 58% to 60%.
 Increase proficiency in Math from 41% to 50% and Learning Gains from 61% to 64%.
 Increase proficiency in Science from 38% to 53%.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through i-Ready diagnostics, Benchmark Assessment System (BAS), District unit assessments, F.A.S.T progress monitoring, as well as Literacy Walks to monitor student performance and instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

LaTanya Greene (latanya.greene@stlucieschools.org)

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

Parkway Elementary will continue to build teacher efficacy and provide multiple opportunities for professional growth and collaboration.

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

Collective teacher efficacy has a mean effect size of 1.57, outweighing other negative factors. By planning collaboratively, with the support of school leadership, to deliver quality standards-based instruction, collective teacher efficacy at Parkway will increase.

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.

In weekly data chats we will analyze all students' data to specifically inform instruction. An emphasis will be placed on students who are in the bottom quartile, approaching proficiency, Tier 2 and Tier 3 and students who are in danger of dropping out of proficiency.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

Collaborative learning and planning daily for all subject areas will be done with fidelity. By collaboratively planning, each teacher's interest, strength, and background can contribute to lessons. Provide cooperative learning and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

To improve classroom instruction, meaningful, granular, and frequent feedback will be provided. Utilizing best practices on feedback and from Get Better Faster, coaches and administration will provide feedback based on needs identified via classroom walks, observations, and teacher-identified needs. The focus will be on delivering actionable feedback with meaningful follow-up and support.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

Teachers will conference with students using data student data notebooks to promote ownership. Conferences will focus on students' individual goals so they understand their strengths and areas for improvement.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

A member of each grade level team will complete the CLP Facilitator Training course on Canvas.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

All teachers will participate in B.E.S.T Standards professional development.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org)

Reading & Math Interventionist will target bottom quartile students for additional supports. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will receive tiered support during non-graded resource times & during the respective content small group time.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mann (tiffany.mann@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

Our area of focus in K-2 will be phonics. Our rationale in focusing on phonics is to strengthen students ability in reading and decoding increasingly complex text fluently and independently. The goal is that over time students will be able to shift their focus to comprehension and building vocabulary.

K- 75%

1st Grade - 46%

2nd Grade - 21%

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

Our area of focus in 3rd-5th grade ELA will be comprehension. Our rationale in focusing on comprehension is to build a deeper understanding of grade level text across all content areas. The goal is that students are able to understand and apply new knowledge independently.

One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA.

3rd Grade- 28%

4th Grade- 40%

5th Grade- 32%

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)

In 2022, 2nd Grade was 21% and we plan to achieve 50% or higher.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The previous outcome 3rd Grade - 50%

4th Grade - 50%

5th Grade - 50%

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.

BAS test three times a year.

I-Ready Diagnostic test two times a year.

PM test three times a year.

End of Units Assessments

Daily CFU (ELA) to guide instruction in the classroom.

CLPs- feedback on lesson design and instructional practices

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Greene, LaTanya, latanya.greene@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?

Tier 1 : Standards -based ELA instruction using Benchmark Advance. Fidelity monitoring by administration and instructional coaches.

Tier 2: Small group instruction using leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI). Fidelity monitoring by administration and instructional coaches, and school counselors.

Tier 3: individual and small group instruction by interventionist (2 reading, 1 math) using researched based interventions from District's Intervention Matrix. Fidelity monitoring by administration, and school counselors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

Benchmark Advanced is the adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. We currently have two (2) reading interventionists. Both individuals are Reading endorsed with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress. The practices/programs listed are research proven and have aided in significant improvements with bottom quartile students and school-wide learning gains in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group – using monitoring tools (BAS, I-Ready Diagnostic, PM testing, CFUs, CLPs, Unit Assessments, K-2 Assessments).	Mann, Tiffany, tiffany.mann@stlucieschools.org
Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention	Sherman, Justin, justin.sherman@stlucieschools.org
Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback	Miller, Dana , dana.miller@stlucieschools.org
Ensure CLPs are productive and following the protocol that will ensure quality, rigorous lessons are being created and implemented in a timely manner. (Monitor pacing...this process will be monitored by the coaches and administration).	Scott-Warren, Neeka, neeka.scott@stlucieschools.org
Literacy Walks and Classroom Observation to monitor and ensure fidelity in all areas. Coaches & administration will monitor this process.	Greene, LaTanya, latanya.greene@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.

Culture and Learning Environment is a priority at Parkway, with a protected block of the day focused on direct instruction and practice in social skills, conflict resolution, and other social-emotional domains. With support from the SLPS Culture and Learning Environment Department, we implement the Sanford Harmony program school wide and follow a district developed scope and sequence for daily lessons and activities. Parkway uses Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school wide to teach expectations, reinforce positive behaviors, and develop a positive classroom and school culture.

Parkway has a VPK program that supports transitioning Kindergarten students. The Kindergarten team utilizes a separate open house time to welcome families and provide school and grade level specific information.

Transition meetings for students graduating from Parkway are coordinated by the school counselor. Students are guided through the process of selecting elective classes at their middle school. Targeted students who meet criteria are provided information sessions regarding magnet schools, feeder programs,

or acceleration options.

As a Kids at Hope and goal-focused school, data reflection includes setting goals and helping students envision what they want for their future, including steps needed to achieve long-term goals. All students utilize data binders to track their data throughout their year and set long term and short-term goals. All students participate in student-led conferences where they share their goals and reflect on their data with families, school staff, and invited business or community partners.

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

Parkway provides a full continuum of mental health supports for students and families. We have two full-time guidance counselors, and a dedicated school social worker, school psychologist, mental health counselor, and behavior analyst. These mental health professionals provide staff training, classroom lessons, targeted small groups, individual counseling, parent education, and referrals to outside agencies.

The school counselor and ESE Specialist coordinate transition meetings for students entering with IEPs, 504s, behavior plans, safety plans, ESOL plans, or other special needs.

Additional structures to support positive culture and environment:

School based PBIS, School Climate, Sunshine, and Culture and Learning Environment Committees.

District support from the Culture and Learning Environment Department.

Consultant support for Single School Culture.