

St. Lucie Public Schools

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



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

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

1801 PANTHER LN, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Nicole	Assistant Principal	12th Grade Assistant Principal. Supervises ELA Department, Reading Department, and Foreign Language Department. Ensures focus is on student learning and engagement. Ensures professional development is implemented and provides support to teachers as they implement strategies in their classroom. Supports school-wide PBIS team.
Alfonso, David	Principal	Instructional Leader in charge of executing and monitoring personnel and the allocation of resources to ensure all students receive equitable access to effective standards based instruction, the supervision and evaluation of Assistant Principals, and all school operations. Ensures adequate professional development is provided to support teachers and to provide them with strategies and resources to support the facilitation of instruction. Ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS
Woltjen, Fred	Assistant Principal	11th Grade Assistant Principal. Supervises Math Department, Science Department, and Guidance Department. Supervises and manages master schedule, progress reports, and report cards.
Gordon, Derek	Assistant Principal	9th Grade Assistant Principal. Supervises Career and Technical Education Department, School-wide Technology, and Testing.
Robinson, Eddie	Assistant Principal	10th Grade Assistant Principal. Supervises Social Students Department, Transportation, NEST, School Safety, and Instructional Materials.
Kennedy, Alicia	Assistant Principal	Oversight of the Marine and Oceanographic Academy (MOA) campus and students. Also supervises Student Services, Master Schedule, ESOL compliance, school counselor, and discipline at MOA campus.
Eliassaint, Fedna	Attendance/ Social Work	Participates on MTSS team to support attendance initiatives. Also works to support all students and families with social and emotional needs.
Miller, Monica	School Counselor	Serves as Guidance Director for the department. Also an active member of the MTSS core team.
Cantaine, Megan	Graduation Coach	Supervises and support all work (academic, attendance, behavior, etc) related to junior and senior classes. Also serves as parent and family liaison for junior and senior students.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Teacher, staff, parents, and students were given a "Needs Assessment," to provide valued input to the development of the school-wide goals. The school leadership team met to review and discuss student performance data as well as needs assessment data. The team then set attainable school-wide goals that were approved by the SIP committee.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP goals will be reviewed monthly as a standing agenda item in every department meeting. SIP goals will also be reviewed at every monthly faculty meeting. SIP goals will also be reviewed weekly in each CLP meeting. As students take unit assessments and data is collected the SIP goals will be reviewed and plan revised as needed.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	358
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	603
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	741

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	29	43	50	33	46	51	37		
ELA Learning Gains				38			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				24			22		
Math Achievement*	13	22	38	22	37	38	17		
Math Learning Gains				40			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			29		
Science Achievement*	46	61	64	39	29	40	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	43	60	66	41	43	48	42		
Middle School Acceleration					46	44			
Graduation Rate	95	91	89	96	58	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	59	70	65	59	60	67	67		
ELP Progress	32	40	45	39			36		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	317
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	96

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	4	
ELL	31	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	4	
HSP	49			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	68			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	42			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	33	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP	45			
MUL	33	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	40	Yes	2	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	29			13			46	43		95	59	32
SWD	21			11			25	20		26	7	33
ELL	11			3			28	23		26	7	32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			8			30	31		47	7	10
HSP	30			15			53	44		68	7	39
MUL	45			17			70				4	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	51			31			75	76		84	6	
FRL	26			11			42	38		51	7	32

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	33	38	24	22	40	45	39	41		96	59	39
SWD	14	26	17	9	40	48	19	19		98	35	30
ELL	14	32	24	11	34	41	22	9		98	35	39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	36	27	12	35	39	27	31		97	49	37
HSP	37	36	16	27	42	52	40	46		95	62	41
MUL	30	32		23			45					
PAC												
WHT	55	46	27	48	48		65	70		94	84	
FRL	27	38	28	18	39	42	35	35		97	54	29

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	37	37	22	17	24	29	56	42		96	67	36
SWD	14	15	13	15	23	24	37	37		93	35	27
ELL	8	25	28	7	21	31	18	5		95	48	36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	29	20	10	23	30	42	27		97	60	38
HSP	40	37	23	17	20	30	65	42		95	64	36
MUL	19	29		30						100	62	
PAC												
WHT	64	57		42	31	15	85	83		94	95	
FRL	32	34	22	13	22	27	50	38		96	65	32

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	30%	48%	-18%	50%	-20%
09	2023 - Spring	25%	42%	-17%	48%	-23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	9%	34%	-25%	50%	-41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	39%	-19%	48%	-28%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	61%	-18%	63%	-20%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	59%	-18%	63%	-22%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

In our 21-22 data our lowest component was math proficiency. Factors that contributed to the students' low performance were:

Students having greater skill deficits due to online learning.
Increased teacher absences due to COVID

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA proficiency showed the greatest decline with a 4% decrease from the previous year scores. Factors that contributed to this decline were:

Students having greater skill deficits due to online learning.
Increased teacher absences due to COVID.
Teacher retention within the ELA department.
Lack of Standards-based instruction

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA learning gains showed the greatest gap with the state, with a 15% deficit.

Students having greater skill deficits due to online learning.
Teacher retention within the ELA department.
Lack of Standards-based instruction
Unable to close the gap of student learning within 1 year time.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Learning gains in math showed the most improvement. We had an intense focus on intervention from the beginning of the school year. Students were provided with remedial skills and well as standards-based remediation throughout the course of the year. Students were taught how to track their progress as they mastered each standard. Instructionally there was a great focus on unpacking each standard and planning lessons that taught to the intended depth of knowledge of each standard.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

N/A

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Standards Based Rigorous Instruction
Increase Student Attendance
Improve Culture & Climate

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math has been an underperforming category for our students historically. Math proficiency was the lowest performing indicator in our data for the 21-22 school year. With our projected 22-23 data it will again be the lowest indicator. With the new employees we have to Westwood this year, we want to ensure that everyone is teaching to the full intent of the standard, planning with the end in mind and collaboratively planning to reach those goals. ELA standards exist in all curriculums across campus and all teachers are held accountable to those standards. Math standards exist in science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Learning Outcomes: The intended outcomes for this area of focus includes increased student achievement on all math assessments (district and state). Also, to have a 5% increase in Math proficiency over the next year (includes at subgroups).

Teacher Practice Outcomes: 90% of teachers will participate in common planning sessions ensuring collaboration in data analysis and sharing best practices to meet students' instructional needs.

Monitoring:

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

We will use a variety of of monitoring techniques to ensure the desired outcome:

Administration present in all CLPs

Weekly Review of Lesson Plans

Data Analysis

Classroom walks

Student attendance

Data chats with teachers, students, and parents

Formal Observations

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fred Woltjen (r.woltjen@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

As an evidence-based strategy to achieve this goal, we will be using performance scales to break standards into digestible learning targets based on declarative and procedural knowledge, as outlined by Moore, Garst, and Marzano (2015). For ELL students, we are strategically scheduling students in English through ESOL and Developmental Language courses. SWD have been scheduled into sections that can best support their needs with support facilitation and teachers that have evidence of high impact. We will provide teachers with trainings of implicit bias and cultural awareness for Economically Disadvantaged students and Black/African American Students. We will provide small group instruction for all subgroups through core classes. Increased technology will also be implemented (IXL).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The scales allow students to see all of the smaller skills associated with a larger standard learning goal. In addition, planning with performance scales allows teachers to see learning whole-to-part and requires that teachers sequence and chunk learning in a student-friendly way. The performance scales also helps

teachers unpack standards into manageable teaching bites, which allows teachers to create targeted formative assessments to measure very specific learning gains toward a specific learning target (Moore, Garst, and Marzano (2015).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Use collaborative planning to review performance scales with teachers.
2. Lead PD to unpack standards into declarative and procedural knowledge.
3. Use collaborative planning to develop formative assessments aligned to specific targets on performance scales.
4. Provide PD on Florida Students.Org, so teachers can watch videos and engage in conversations around the true intent of the standards.
5. Instructional coaches model how to use performance scales with students in a classroom setting.

Person Responsible: Fred Woltjen (r.woltjen@stlucieschools.org)

By When: The completion of the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA proficiency for 9th and 10 grade students was defined as an area of focus. Our overall proficiency of 33% which is an eight-point decrease from our 2019 results during a COVID year with many obstacles. Specifically, as it relates to understanding the new BEST Standards and collaborating on ways to teach them effectively to students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Learning Outcomes: Overall, ELA proficiency for 9th and 10th grade increases eight points which would make our achievement goal 41%. This is based on previous achievement data from standards-based instruction. (Includes are subgroups)

Teacher Practice Outcomes: 90% of teachers will participate in common planning sessions ensuring collaboration in data analysis and sharing best practices to meet students' instructional needs. Participation in CLPs will also improve the development of standards-based instruction the meet the intent of each standard.

Monitoring:

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

We will use a variety of of monitoring techniques to ensure the desired outcome:

- Administration present in all CLPs
- Weekly Review of Lesson Plans
- Data Analysis
- District Unit Assessments
- Classroom walks
- Student attendance
- Data chats with teachers, students, and parents
- Formal Observations
- PM1 and PM2 Student Results
- Literacy Walks to ensure standards based instruction

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Smith (nicole.smith@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) monitored by the Assistant Principal will take place during common planning. Instructors teaching like classes will work together to create rigorous lessons based on the standards The CLP model will be followed with fidelity across instructional areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To provide a blueprint for planning for creating fluid instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits all solution but rather dynamic approaches that can be customized and adjusted to meet the needs of the individual. The CLP process suggests that proper implementation increase student achievement and promotes teacher collaboration. Ensuring that

all teachers work together collaboratively to design quality lessons and streamline the planning and data evaluation process.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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: Fred Woltjen (r.woltjen@stlucieschools.org)

By When: September 1, 2023

Teachers will be trained in UDL, Backwards Design, FDLRS modifiers, the CLP process, and the BEST standards. Warning signs will be identified and traced using key data points using Skyward, PowerBi, Excel, Ondrive, and Performance Matters.

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

By When:

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Area of Focus is student attendance. During the 22-23 school year more than 50% of our students were absent for 20 or more days.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Have a 10% decrease in the number of students that have 20 or more absences for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance will be monitored through a variety of sources:

MTSS-Attendance Team

Teachers

Attendance Clerk

Skyward

Gradation Coach

School Counselor

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Alfonso (david.alfonso1@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To conduct monthly MTSS-Attendance meetings using early warning indicators to identify at risk students. An i-Succeed Leadership team was created with specific school-wide staff. Student risk data is tracked by using PowerBi, Skyward, Excel, and Onedrive. Once the data is collected, it's imputed into a live tracking sheet where PSTs and individual student progress plans are generated. Biweekly the tracking sheet is updated, and the identified leadership team meets biweekly to address individual student needs based off the collected data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the post COVID error many students are still struggling with face-to-face learning, versus the virtual options that were provided during the pandemic. These interventions will help to provide a safe, secure, and predictable enforcement for all students and staff in schools. This is a systems-based approach to "re-norming" our student expectations with focus on face-to-face rigorous instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Schedule and facilitate meetings with identified at risk students. Mandatory meeting that includes, student, parent/guardian, grade level assistant principal, assigned school counselor, and graduation coach as needed.

Person Responsible: David Alfonso (david.alfonso1@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Meetings will begin by the conclusion of the 1st nine weeks (October 13th, 2023).

If attendance improves, continue to monitor student progress and celebrate success.

Person Responsible: David Alfonso (david.alfonso1@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monitoring of student attendance will continue on a monthly basis for each student.

If attendance does not improve, schedule a PST meeting and reevaluate the student's success plan. Determine what additional resources or supports the student/family needs.

Person Responsible: David Alfonso (david.alfonso1@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Monitoring of student attendance will continue on a monthly basis for each student. PST meetings will be scheduled on an as needed basis for each student.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

SAC

Partnership with district Administrator on Special Assignment overseeing grants

Work with district curriculum department to fund approved resources

Partner with Federal and Special Programs Manager for Title 1 to plan budgets

Partner with Coordinator for Title 1 to plan parent involvement events and resources

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy plans on utilizing multiple facets of mass communication through SLPS's

school messenger, Skyward Parent Portal, School App, and our school's social media outlets to share the information within the SIP plan. SIP plan will also be shared in our SAC meetings and translated into

Spanish and Creole for our non-English speaking families.

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fpw/>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Fort Pierce Westwood Academy plans on utilizing multiple facets of mass communication through SLPS's school messenger, Skyward Parent Portal, School App, and our school's social media outlets to increase positive relationships with all stakeholders. Increasing our forms of communication fosters a level of transparency to parents, families, community members that need to be informed about our school. In addition, all stakeholders are invited to partake in our School Advisory Council, as this group's primary function is to evaluate and advise on the progression of the School Improvement Plan. Student families attend our School Advisory Council monthly meetings and offer input in the decision-making process. Home visits occur as an intervention to academics or behavior, but they have proven to strengthen the relationship with our families and promote parent involvement. In addition, we are using Panorama survey results to gauge where improvements to school culture need to be made. Fort Pierce Westwood Academy earned the PBIS award for being a Model Resilient school in 2020-2021. We will continue to build and implement our PBIS plan in the 2023-2024 school year.

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fpw/>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

At Ft. Pierce Westwood Academy we are using restorative practices as a method to increase instructional time for students. We are providing our teachers and staff with adequate professional learning on student engagement strategies, best instructional practices, teaching to the intent of the standards. As previously stated in our core content areas we have placed a heavy emphasis on the Collaborative Learning and Planning process to ensure high rigor, standards-based instruction.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Working with our grants department has afforded us the opportunity to provide additional resources to students in core content and CTE courses.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

School-based social worker on campus to provide any student with additional supports to increase their academic success. Students have access to the school-based social worker at all times while on campus.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students are provided a host of postsecondary and workforce opportunities while in high school. Our career and technical education programs include, but are not limited:

- Agriculture
- Robotics
- Criminal Justice
- Veterinary

Students are given the opportunity to earn certifications that would make them marketable and competitive within the workforce upon graduation.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

PBIS is celebrated weekly with recognition over the announcements for students and staff alike that have been "caught" doing the right thing during the week. The past school year Fort Pierce Westwood Academy was recognized for being a Model resilient school for the first time.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional learning is provided on a monthly basis for all staff. Professional learning opportunities may be offered through the district face-to-face on content and best instructional practices. Other professional learning opportunities may be completed virtually in self-paced online courses (covering any topic of their choice). We also school based professional learning opportunities where the content was selected by the staff.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes