

School District of Osceola County, FL

Westside K 8 School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 28 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 29 |

Westside K 8 School

2551 WESTSIDE BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34747

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Henry Santiago

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 90% |
| 2019-20 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 | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

* 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 Osceola 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 29 |

Westside K 8 School

2551 WESTSIDE BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34747

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School PK-8 | Yes | 75% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 77% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | B | B | B |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.

Westside K8 School creates a student-centered learning environment in which students exhibit consistent academic and personal growth using problem solving strategies. Our school promotes a safe, caring and supportive environment that empowers students to self-advocate through motivation and determination to succeed academically and personally each academic year. We foster integrity, accountability, and responsibility. We encourage families and our community to partner in supporting academic and personal growth in all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our community at Westside K-8 strives to develop motivated students who self-advocate using strategies to solve problems and who experience consistent academic growth with integrity and determination.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Ray, Christina | Principal | Oversee the school's day-to-day operations, including handling disciplinary matters, conducting classroom observations, managing a budget and hiring teachers and other personnel. Develops and monitors the SIP. Logistics, schedules, teacher and staff evaluations, and public relations are also major responsibilities. |
| Dunn, Paul | Instructional Coach | Oversees all math instruction, including using math curriculum, assisting teachers with implementing the math instructional model, and providing professional development. The coach helps teams lesson plan, utilize math resources, and provide interventions to struggling students. |
| Graham, Joyce | Assistant Principal | Supports in the principal overseeing all functions of the school, including handling discipline matters and leading schoolwide instruction through classroom walkthroughs, feedback, and professional development. Assists the principal in developing and monitoring the implementation of the SIP. |
| Baker, Kristyn | School Counselor | Oversee 5-6 individual and small group counseling. Create and deliver classroom lessons on social-emotional learning and character development. Monitor and develop incentives for student attendance. Create and implement incentives tied to PBIS character traits (PRIDE). Work cooperatively with other stakeholders to provide social-emotional and behavioral support to respective grade levels. |
| Mcclintock, Julie | Instructional Coach | Oversee all MTSS operations. Assists teachers in identifying, planning, and implementing interventions for students needing remediation and enrichment. |
| Miller, Heather | Assistant Principal | Supports in the principal overseeing all functions of the school, including handling discipline matters and leading schoolwide instruction through classroom walkthroughs, feedback, and professional development. Assists the principal in developing and monitoring the implementation of the SIP. |
| Azis, Kimberly | Instructional Coach | Oversees all ELA instruction grades 6-8, including using ELA curriculum, assisting teachers with implementing the ELA instructional model, and providing professional development. The coach helps teams lesson plan, utilize ELA resources, and provide interventions to struggling students. |
| Stewart, Morrisia | Dean | Oversee middle grades 7-8 school behavior and discipline. Work with guidance and MTSS to provide students with behavioral support and intervention. Work with teachers to establish positive classroom routines and procedures, build positive relationships with students, and incentive positive behavior through PBIS. |
| Pillot, Girany | School Counselor | Oversee 7th and 8th individual and small group counseling. Create and deliver classroom lessons on social-emotional learning and character |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | development. Monitor and develop incentives for student attendance. Create and implement incentives tied to PBIS character traits (PRIDE). Work cooperatively with other stakeholders to provide social-emotional and behavioral support to respective grade levels. |
| Blakeney, Patricia | School Counselor | Oversee grades K-4 behavior and discipline. Work with guidance and MTSS to provide students with behavioral support and intervention. Work with teachers to establish positive classroom routines and procedures, build positive relationships with students, and incentive positive behavior through PBIS. |
| Brown, Kathy | Instructional Coach | As the RCS, Kathy is responsible for helping to supervise the instruction of the ESE teachers as well as attend and assist with IEP formulation and compliance pieces relative to ESE. |
| Allen, Michael | Other | |
| Coombes, Austin | School Counselor | Oversee 3-4 individual and small group counseling. Create and deliver classroom lessons on social-emotional learning and character development. Monitor and develop incentives for student attendance. Create and implement incentives tied to PBIS character traits (PRIDE). Work cooperatively with other stakeholders to provide social-emotional and behavioral support to respective grade levels. |
| Sanford, Kevin | Dean | Oversee grades 5-6 behavior and discipline. Work with guidance and MTSS to provide students with behavioral support and intervention. Work with teachers to establish positive classroom routines and procedures, build positive relationships with students, and incentive positive behavior through PBIS. |
| Rivera, Francisco | Assistant Principal | Supports in the principal overseeing all functions of the school, including handling discipline matters and leading schoolwide instruction through classroom walkthroughs, feedback, and professional development. Assists the principal in developing and monitoring the implementation of the SIP. |
| Swiderski, Kristi | Instructional Coach | Oversees all Science instruction grades K-8, including using science curriculum, assisting teachers with implementing the science instructional model, and providing professional development. The coach helps teams lesson plan, utilize science resources, and provide interventions to struggling students. |
| Cowen, Amanda | Instructional Coach | Testing coordinator, new teacher support, struggling teacher support |
| Perez, Michelle | Other | ELL Support and compliance |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Sanabria, Lissie | Other | ELL Support and compliance |
| Howard, Allen | Instructional Coach | Oversees all ELA instruction grades K-5, including using ELA curriculum, assisting teachers with implementing the ELA instructional model, and providing professional development. The coach helps teams lesson plan, utilize ELA resources, and provide interventions to struggling students. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/4/2018, Henry Santiago

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

101

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

138

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 90% |
| 2019-20 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 | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

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 | 127 | 166 | 172 | 192 | 198 | 210 | 196 | 237 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1712 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**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 | 154 | 163 | 187 | 196 | 199 | 185 | 214 | 204 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1700 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 23 | 21 | 33 | 25 | 30 | 18 | 34 | 29 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 19 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 63 | 72 | 91 | 82 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 405 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 25 | 16 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 154 | 163 | 187 | 196 | 199 | 185 | 214 | 204 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1700 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 102 | 100 | 114 | 121 | 113 | 96 | 130 | 105 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 994 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 99 | 91 | 112 | 101 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 532 |

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 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 24 | 43 | 25 | 33 | 34 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 211 |

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 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 48% | 56% | 61% | 46% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | 57% | 59% | 54% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | 55% | 54% | 45% | 54% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 47% | 52% | 62% | 43% | 50% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 54% | 55% | 59% | 51% | 55% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 49% | 52% | 48% | 52% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 46% | 49% | 56% | 42% | 47% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 76% | 75% | 78% | 81% | 71% | 75% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (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.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 43% | 51% | -8% | 58% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 57% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 04 | 2019 | 41% | 51% | -10% | 58% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 48% | -8% | 56% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 36% | 48% | -12% | 56% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 50% | -10% | 55% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 43% | 48% | -5% | 54% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 30% | 46% | -16% | 52% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 32% | 47% | -15% | 52% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 46% | -4% | 51% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 44% | 49% | -5% | 56% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 52% | -5% | 58% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 42% | 54% | -12% | 62% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 51% | -7% | 62% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 44% | 53% | -9% | 64% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 53% | -9% | 62% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 48% | -8% | 60% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 52% | -11% | 61% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 30% | 45% | -15% | 55% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 43% | -15% | 52% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 31% | 30% | 1% | 54% | -23% |
| | 2018 | 26% | 29% | -3% | 54% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 34% | 47% | -13% | 46% | -12% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 36% | 43% | -7% | 45% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 30% | 45% | -15% | 53% | -23% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 49% | -1% | 55% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 36% | 42% | -6% | 48% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 42% | 2% | 50% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 62% | 38% | 67% | 33% |
| 2018 | 100% | 68% | 32% | 65% | 35% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 71% | 73% | -2% | 71% | 0% |
| 2018 | 75% | 70% | 5% | 71% | 4% |
| Compare | | -4% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 93% | 49% | 44% | 61% | 32% |
| 2018 | 93% | 52% | 41% | 62% | 31% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 44% | 56% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 92% | 39% | 53% | 56% | 36% |
| Compare | | 8% | | | |

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 | 19 | 45 | 41 | 16 | 47 | 40 | 13 | 25 | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 51 | 50 | 39 | 52 | 46 | 30 | 59 | 89 | | |
| BLK | 45 | 61 | 50 | 40 | 58 | 54 | 36 | 70 | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 49 | 51 | 40 | 50 | 44 | 40 | 69 | 85 | | |
| MUL | 47 | 43 | | 48 | 57 | | 57 | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 60 | 50 | 62 | 63 | 54 | 55 | 93 | 84 | | |
| FRL | 44 | 50 | 52 | 40 | 51 | 48 | 38 | 68 | 81 | | |
| 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 | 18 | 42 | 34 | 15 | 26 | 23 | 19 | 39 | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 53 | 51 | 29 | 48 | 51 | 28 | 33 | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 45 | 44 | 38 | 45 | 33 | 63 | 82 | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 56 | 52 | 38 | 51 | 50 | 47 | 70 | 82 | | |
| MUL | 64 | 62 | | 64 | 58 | | 64 | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 55 | 52 | 56 | 55 | 46 | 70 | 84 | 88 | | |
| FRL | 39 | 53 | 47 | 35 | 48 | 45 | 48 | 67 | 82 | | |
| 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 | 16 | 32 | 21 | 15 | 37 | 34 | 24 | 38 | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 46 | 44 | 27 | 49 | 47 | 19 | 69 | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 54 | 50 | 34 | 52 | 52 | 17 | 58 | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 49 | 45 | 38 | 51 | 49 | 37 | 78 | 71 | | |
| MUL | 52 | 57 | | 64 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 63 | 45 | 55 | 51 | 45 | 64 | 96 | 77 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 54 | 49 | 42 | 52 | 47 | 37 | 77 | 79 | | |

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) | TS&I |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| 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 | 60 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 565 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 51 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 53 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 50 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 65 |
| 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 | 53 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

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.

Overall our students with disabilities were the lowest in all categories. Many of our students had multi year gaps and our MTSS process was not well organized to support them. As well the teachers of the students with Autism did not offer the rigor and structure needed for students to succeed.

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

Our Hispanic students fell in both reading and math learning gains. Overall math fell. This was due to new and struggling teachers in the math department. Three International teachers were hired as part of the EPI program and two did not make it the entire year. There was a learning curve they could not cover. We did not support students learning English as a second language and sheltered classes did not lead to students gaining quick grasp of the language. Science showed a huge drop as well. We added a science coach as science was not being taught consistently across the grade levels.

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 showed the greatest gap. The low achievement of our predominately Hispanic population increased the gap.

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

All of our data components showed some increase according to district formatives. This was due to improved PLC planning and coaching cycles.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our seventh and eighth grade has the highest number of students with two or more indicators. The seventh graders have struggled for several years and gaps are widening. Also given the numbers completing learning digitally there is concern for attendance and additional indicators.

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

1. ESE achievement
2. Math achievement
3. ELA achievement
4. Science achievement
5. School safety

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Current learning gains for math are close to district average but well below state average. The goal will be to increase learning gains from current 54% to 58% by focusing on the use of content glossaries and performance assessment math instruction.

Measurable Outcome: All student achievement in math will increase to 58% from 2019 score of 54% as measured by the Mathematics Florida Statewide Assessment (FSA) administered in May.

ELL student growth in math will increase 5% from 2019 as measured by the Mathematics Florida Statewide Assessment (FSA) administered in May.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Paul Dunn (paul.dunn@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: By increasing the PLC teams ability to create formative assessments, analyze their data appropriately, and then use their data to drive the instructional math model, student achievement will increase.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: "Effective use of data is key to improving student outcomes. This requires leaders to ensure teachers have developed the skills to convert student data to useful information to effectively plan for instruction and student interventions; to hold collaborative discussions that are structured for these purposes; to broaden the view of data to include student papers, products and performances; and to broaden the view of assessment to include assessment-on-the-fly. Thus, they empower teachers to climb fully into the "driver's seat" in the multi-faceted undertaking of using data to drive instruction."
 (Willhelm, 2011, Educational Leadership)

Action Steps to Implement

Prioritize grade levels to focus on intensive data cycle support.

Person Responsible Paul Dunn (paul.dunn@osceolaschools.net)

Support Math PLC teams in development of common assessments using the School city platform, keeping FSA test specs a priority in tested grades.

Person Responsible Paul Dunn (paul.dunn@osceolaschools.net)

Support data analysis of common assessments and NWEA results through individual and team data meetings.

Person Responsible Amanda Cowen (amanda.cowen@osceolaschools.net)

Meet with Math PLC teams to develop and incorporate the math instruction delivery model and make instructional decisions based on data analysis of common assessments and NWEA diagnostic assessments.

Person Responsible Paul Dunn (paul.dunn@osceolaschools.net)

Ongoing training of PLC facilitators, specifically in areas of assessment development, leading data analysis, team planning.

Person Responsible Amanda Cowen (amanda.cowen@osceolaschools.net)

Use Reflex Math program as an intervention and practice for students who struggle with automaticity of math facts.

Person Responsible Paul Dunn (paul.dunn@osceolaschools.net)

Implement the use of content glossaries in all math instruction for student who are non-native to English instruction.

Person Responsible Paul Dunn (paul.dunn@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | Based on the 2018-29 and 2019-2020 school data, ELA learning gains is below the state average of 54%. |
| Description and Rationale: | The goal is to increase to 58% which is beyond the state average by focusing on vocabulary development and effective literacy practices. Additionally the use of AVID note-taking and organization will build a post-secondary culture with students. |
| Measurable Outcome: | All student achievement in ELA will increase 7% from 2019 as measured by the ELA Florida Statewide Assessment (FSA) administered in May. ELL student growth in ELA will increase 7% from 2019 as measured by the ELA Florida Statewide Assessment (FSA) administered in May. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Kimberly Azis (kimberly.azis@osceolaschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Implement effective use of research based literacy programs (Guided Reading, Achieve 3000, Core Connections, LLI, Corrective Reading, Words Their Way) to increase reading achievement. Achieve research shows that students who spend one hour a week learning with Achieve3000 Literacy will attain at least 2X their expected growth. https://www.achieve3000.com/products/achieve3000-literacy/ Corrective Reading Evaluation Studies have shown students made 2 or more years' growth after implementation (Kasendorf, S. J.; McQuaid, P.) |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | In guided reading, teachers provide specific demonstrations and teaching of comprehension strategies such as inferring, synthesizing, analyzing, and critiquing. Teachers prompt readers to think and talk in these strategic ways. The National Reading Panel (NICHD, 2000) has suggested that teaching a combination of reading comprehension techniques is highly effective in helping students recall information, generate questions, and summarize texts. |

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students' current achievement level using baseline data

Person Responsible Kimberly Azis (kimberly.azis@osceolaschools.net)

Align evidence based strategy with student need.

Person Responsible Allen Howard (allen.kujawa@osceolaschools.net)

Identify and train K-5 teachers on effective implementation of Guided Reading.

Person Responsible Allen Howard (allen.kujawa@osceolaschools.net)

Identify and train 6-8 teachers on effective implementation of the 5 Step Literacy Model in Achieve 3000.

Person Responsible Kimberly Azis (kimberly.azis@osceolaschools.net)

Identify and train teachers who provide Tier 3 Interventions on Corrective Reading, Leveled Literacy Intervention, and Words Their Way.

Person Responsible Kimberly Azis (kimberly.azis@osceolaschools.net)

Provide continuous training and support to ELA teachers in Core Connections strategies.

Person Responsible Allen Howard (allen.kujawa@osceolaschools.net)

Develop a walk-through tool to measure fidelity of implementation in the use of evidence based strategies.

Person Responsible Kimberly Azis (kimberly.azis@osceolaschools.net)

Utilize each evidence based program's assessments to progress monitor at least monthly.

Person Responsible Allen Howard (allen.kujawa@osceolaschools.net)

Meet as a problem solving team monthly to analyze Progress Monitoring data and make instructional decisions regarding core instruction and intervention.

Person Responsible Allen Howard (allen.kujawa@osceolaschools.net)

Create and embed use of Scales cognates for ELL students.

Person Responsible Lissie Sanabria (lissie.sanabriarosado@osceolaschools.net)

Train teachers on the effective use of Heritage Language Glossaries by October 1.

Person Responsible Lissie Sanabria (lissie.sanabriarosado@osceolaschools.net)

Monitor classroom implementation of glossaries in classrooms.

Person Responsible Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

Use AVID organizational strategies to help all student build post secondary school habits and supports.

Person Responsible Heather Miller (heather.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Continue to implement note taking strategies and use of AVID notebook.

Person Responsible Joyce Graham (joyce.graham@osceolaschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Academic data shows the students with disabilities at Westside are not achieving as their peers achieve. The group fell below the achievement level of the ESSA subgroups for two years in a row. Students with ESE are the school's only subgroup who does not achieve above the 41% mark which shows we must alter our strategies to reach students are identified as ESE.

Measurable Outcome: ESE student achievement in math will increase 5% from 2019 as measured by the Mathematics Florida Statewide Assessment (FSA) administered in May.
ESE student achievement in language arts will increase by 5% from 2019 as measured by the ELA FSA administered in May.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathy Brown (kathryn.brown@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: -ESE teachers will meet monthly as a PLC to analyze and student data and teacher use of accommodations.
-ESE teachers will meet weekly with each grade level PLC on their caseload to offer suggestions and support to the students on their caseload.
-ESE teachers will use NWEA results to plan specific lessons and strategies to increase the skills of the students on their caseload.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers who work in a professional learning communities benefit from the expertise of others. The use of specific accommodations and strategies for ESE students has shown to increase the achievement of students who struggle academically.(Dufour 2008)

Action Steps to Implement

ESE teachers will meet monthly to monitor student outcomes and track general education teacher use of accommodations.

Person Responsible Christina Ray (christina.ray@osceolaschools.net)

ESE teachers will use results of NWEA to specifically plan interventions and lessons.

Person Responsible Kathy Brown (kathryn.brown@osceolaschools.net)

ESE teachers will track weekly the use of ESE IEP accommodations for struggling learners.

Person Responsible Christina Ray (christina.ray@osceolaschools.net)

In PLC, ESE teachers will identify three high yield strategies to use in supporting their caseload in the classroom.

Person Responsible Christina Ray (christina.ray@osceolaschools.net)

New and struggling ESE teachers will participate in lesson study to strengthen their academic effectiveness.

Person Responsible Amanda Cowen (amanda.cowen@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | According to the results of the 2020 schoolwide Panorama School Climate Survey less than 60% of the student body feels emotionally safe in the school setting. This shows a need for emotional supports and staff connection to help students feel safe. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>Increase the percentage of students 3-5 feeling safe from 46%-51% as measured by the Panorama School Climate Survey administered in March.</p> <p>Increase the percentage of students 6-8 feeling safe from 60%-66% as measured by the Panorama School Climate Survey administered in March.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Utilize school-wide PBIS structures including teach-to's and positive culture procedures. Utilize Panorama to target guidance lessons specifically to the needs of groups of students relating to school safety.</p> <p>In a 2020 analysis of Panorama student survey topics, the Panorama research team made use of data from approximately 3,500,000 student survey takers in more than 5,900 schools to determine their measures as reliable and valid.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports is a systems approach to establishing the social culture and behavioral supports needed for all children in a school to achieve both social and academic success. PBIS is not a packaged curriculum, but an approach that defines core elements that can be achieved through a variety of strategies (Horner, Sagai, Lewis 2015).</p> <p>Research shows that successfully implementing the approach reduces suspensions as well as overall behavior problems that result in student referrals to the principal's office. ... A 2012 EdSource survey showed that PBIS was by far the most popular behavior management system in place in California school districts. Jan 31, 2018</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

Each member of the leadership team will be assigned 8-12 students from the Early Warning Indicator list to informally mentor and check in on. Additional students will be added as needs arise relating to personal and school safety based on staff observation and feedback.

Person Responsible Morrisia Stewart (morrisia.stewart@osceolaschools.net)

The guidance team will provide lessons to student groups using Panorama resources identified to support the need of students related to school safety.

Person Responsible Kristyn Baker (kristyn.baker@osceolaschools.net)

Dean team will meet weekly in a PLC to study discipline data and implement further strategies and supports relating to school and student safety.

Person Responsible Kevin Sanford (kevin.sanford@osceolaschools.net)

Identify students who indicated they did not feel safe on the Panorama Survey or counselor survey and provide lessons to the classes those students attend based on school safety and belonging. Ensure the students have a safe adult in the school as well to connect with.

Person Responsible Girany Pillot (girany.pillotosorio@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on the 2018-29 and 2019-2020 school data, Science achievement is below the state average of 56%. The goal is to increase to 58% which is beyond the state average by focusing on vocabulary development and inquiry thinking. |
|---|--|

Measurable Outcome: Increase science from to 58% as measured by the FSSA given in May.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heather Miller (heather.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Science has shown great improvement but we will continue to work on the 5E model of inquiry and ensuring high fidelity of science instruction. Science instruction is happening in all classrooms regularly but it is not high quality at all times and many times teachers teach beyond the scope of the standard. This wastes instructional time. The lack of inquiry effects student understanding of content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Inquiry is a multifaceted activity that involves making observations; posing questions; examining books and other sources of information to see what is already known; planning investigations; reviewing what is already known in light of experimental evidence; using tools to gather, analyze, and interpret data; proposing answers, explanations, and predictions; and communicating the results. (Duran and Duran 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of content glossaries for ELL students to access the vocabulary in their native language supported by the ELL paras in the classroom.

Person Responsible Lissie Sanabria (lissie.sanabriarosado@osceolaschools.net)

2. Present training and support for teachers in the use of content glossaries.

Person Responsible Kristi Swiderski (kristine.swiderski@osceolaschools.net)

3. Identify model classrooms to use for teachers who need additional support in the use of content glossaries.

Person Responsible Kristi Swiderski (kristine.swiderski@osceolaschools.net)

4. Hold inquiry training to support teachers new to school who have not had inquiry training.

Person Responsible Kristi Swiderski (kristine.swiderski@osceolaschools.net)

5. Work with PLCs to ensure curriculum unit plans and standard analysis occur so the depth of the standard is met and not extended.

Person Responsible Amanda Cowen (amanda.cowen@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

All priorities addressed.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our school is an AVID site. Through the use of AVID students are matched with mentors and supported with strategies for post-secondary careers. The school uses Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) to help students learn strategies to cope with their feelings and learn alternatives to unsafe behavior. PBIS also supports positive behavior and rewards those who do the right thing daily. Finally the administrative team offers periodic team building and culture building events to help with teacher culture and offers an open-door policy to address needs quickly and effectively.

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school suspension, and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and What needs to be done. Such as, Establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on schoolwide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to

students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC

council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue.

Seeking

input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We

also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate

(schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for

the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, The school provides all teachers with

training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$3,300.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0302 - Westside K 8 School | School Improvement Funds | | \$3,300.00 |
| <i>Notes: Reflex Math Annual Contract</i> | | | | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$5,300.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0302 - Westside K 8 School | General Fund | | \$5,300.00 |
| <i>Notes: Subs for training days</i> | | | | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$2,800.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0302 - Westside K 8 School | General Fund | | \$2,800.00 |
| <i>Notes: Corrective Reading books</i> | | | | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | \$6,700.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0302 - Westside K 8 School | General Fund | | \$5,000.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|--------|--------|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------|
| | | | Notes: PBIS Incentives | | | |
| | | | 0302 - Westside K 8 School | School Improvement Funds | | \$1,200.00 |
| | | | Notes: Train staff on Why Try | | | |
| | | | 0302 - Westside K 8 School | School Improvement Funds | | \$500.00 |
| | | | Notes: Red Ribbon Week | | | |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | | | | \$18,100.00 |