West Shore Junior/Senior High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

West Shore Junior/Senior High School

250 WILDCAT ALLEY, Melbourne, FL 32935

http://www.westshore.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Eric Fleming T

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2006

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (91%) 2017-18: A (91%) 2016-17: A (92%) 2015-16: A (91%) 2014-15: A (98%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

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

West Shore Junior/Senior High School

250 WILDCAT ALLEY, Melbourne, FL 32935

http://www.westshore.brevard.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	No	12%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

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.

West Shore Junior/Senior High School, a center for excellence, creates a nurturing secondary learning environment (grades 7-12) that provides students with unique experiences for intellectual development, academic achievement, and preparation for life's work.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excellence Achieved

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fleming, Rick	Principal	
Orton, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Franco, Amy	Instructional Media	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	175	154	163	147	142	955
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3	6	3	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3	3	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
59

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/6/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	97%	59%	56%	97%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	52%	51%	77%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	40%	42%	82%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	98%	48%	51%	99%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	85%	49%	48%	82%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	85%	45%	45%	79%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	95%	66%	68%	98%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	98%	70%	73%	99%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	174 (0)	175 (0)	154 (0)	163 (0)	147 (0)	142 (0)	955 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 ()	3 ()	2 ()	3 ()	6 ()	3 ()	21 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	16 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
07	2019	94%	58%	36%	52%	42%
	2018	91%	56%	35%	51%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	96%	63%	33%	56%	40%
	2018	95%	65%	30%	58%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
09	2019	99%	62%	37%	55%	44%
	2018	100%	60%	40%	53%	47%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
10	2019	98%	59%	39%	53%	45%
	2018	99%	61%	38%	53%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	99%	62%	37%	54%	45%
	2018	99%	62%	37%	54%	45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-99%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	90%	53%	37%	48%	42%
	2018	92%	55%	37%	50%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	66%	34%	67%	33%
2018	99%	67%	32%	65%	34%
Compare		1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	74%	24%	71%	27%
2018	100%	73%	27%	71%	29%
Compare		-2%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	71%	28%	70%	29%
2018	100%	70%	30%	68%	32%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	61%	38%	61%	38%
2018	98%	62%	36%	62%	36%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	60%	38%	57%	41%
2018	99%	60%	39%	56%	43%
Compare		-1%			

Subgroup Data

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	85	75		90	70						
ASN	100	75		100	92		95	96	100	100	100
BLK	100	70		100	92			100			
HSP	95	64	67	90	82	64	86	100	87	100	100
MUL	100	64	73	100	84			100	100	100	100
WHT	96	75	76	99	84	86	96	98	100	100	99
FRL	100	72	71	95	86	83	91	100	96	100	93
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	91	64									
ASN	96	73	91	100	88		100	100	100		
BLK	100	73		95	74		100	100			
HSP	100	79	100	100	89	87	93	100	100	100	100
MUL	98	74	100	100	84			95	100	100	
WHT	96	75	77	99	81	75	96	100	99	100	100
FRL	97	77	90	99	72	68	96	100	97	100	100
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	100	86		94	60						
ASN	94	70	64	100	89		100	95	100	100	94
BLK	86	71	70	100	76	77	90	100			
HSP	96	74	79	100	86	95	97	97	100	100	100
MUL	100	72	85	100	81			100	100	100	100
WHT	98	79	84	98	82	80	98	100	100	99	96
FRL	92	67	67	99	83	77	100	97	100	100	100

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	91
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	1006
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	80
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	92
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	85
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	92
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	92
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	90
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Although West Shore Jr/Sr High School remains among the highest performing schools in the district and state with regard to assessment results, we do focus on areas that we see trend data declines. Our most recent review of scores shows a decline of 2% within our overall 2019 ELA Learning Gains from 75% of students scoring at Level 3 and above to 73% of students scoring at Level 3 and above. This data also negatively correlated with our ELA students in the Lowest 25% in regards to Learning Gains and reflects the absence of a key ELA teacher on leave for the entire 2018-2019 school year. While we had a certified ELA Teacher in that particular classroom, the continuity of instruction and degree of expertise were missing. This was reflected in student scores and grades.

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

During a comprehensive review of our 2018-2019 assessment data, West Shore saw a 6 point drop on ELA Learning Gains for our Lowest 25% from 82% of students scoring at Level 3 and above down to 77% of students scoring at Level 3 and above . A contributing factor to this drop was a key teacher in our English Department who was out on medical leave last year and her absence disrupted some continuity in instruction for some of our students. The drop does not appear to be part of an ongoing downward trend with regard to ELA assessment results.

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.

West Shore remains well above the district and state averages in ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies (Civics), SAT, ACT, AP Scores, and PSAT.

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

2019 Mathematics students in the Lowest 25% had Learning Gains that showed a 10 point improvement from 75% of students scoring at Level 3 and above to 85% of students scoring at Level 3 and above. We shifted some teaching assignments around to maximize some expertise in math scaffolding. Our math department uses interactive notebooks for several math subjects and this delivery variation seemed to have developed more math confidence in some of our lower performing students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

It appears from review of the ESSA data that our Students With Disabilities had 80% of students scoring at Level 3 and above on the 2019 FSA compared to all other groups which scored at 90% at Level 3 and above.

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

1. Improve ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains scoring Level 3 or above from 2018-2019.
2. Meet or exceed Assessment thresholds in ELA, Math, SS, Science, SAT, AP, PSAT, ACT.
3. Meet or exceed our 1006 point overall School Grade Accountability score.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Florida Standards Assessment - English Language Arts Lowest 25 Percentile
Rationale	During a comprehensive review of our 2018-2019 assessment data, West Shore saw a 6 point drop on ELA Learning Gains for our Lowest 25% from 82% down to 77%. A contributing factor to this drop was a key teacher in our English Department was on medical leave last year and her absence disrupted some continuity in instruction for some of our students. The drop does not appear to be part of an ongoing downward trend with regard to ELA assessment results.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	West Shore Jr/Sr High school will increase our ELA Lowest 25% students scores from 77% of students scoring at Level 3 and above on the 2019 FSA to 80% of students scoring at Level 3 and above on the 2020 FSA ELA test.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rick Fleming (fleming.rick@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Under the CRISS (CReating Independence Through Student Owned Strategies) umbrella we decided to focus on Webb's Depth of Knowledge and higher order questioning during our 2019 SIP cycle. While we were pleased with some growth in the area of having students interpret complex text, we wanted to go a step further in 2020 by using the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) as a mechanism to track complex text at the center of teachers' lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	After a brief overview of using the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) to observe classrooms from district leadership during summer training, we decided that we would employ this strategy with our walk-throughs for the 2020 School Year. In order to calibrate our leadership team in using the instrument we sought help from our district resource teacher, Nancy Gray, who trained and accompanied our leadership team on our walk-throughs in September 2019. Starting out small this year, our main focus is to tally our IPG's using Core Action 1 of the model. If through Core Action 1 observation we determine that text is at the center of the lesson then the next step is to determine if the text is grade level appropriate or complex enough. Of the 20 classrooms observed, it was determined that 12 had some form of text at the center of the lesson.

Action Step	
Description	1. Read and Review Instructional Practice Guide - Core Action 1 2. Review and provide overview to teachers on the Instructional Practice Guide 3. Set up Training with ELA Resource Teacher for West Shore Administrative Team 4. Calibrate using walk-through data gathered 5. Provide feedback/discussion opportunity with teachers
Person Responsible	Rick Fleming (fleming.rick@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).